

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 13 November 2014

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 12 NOVEMBER 2014

Please find attached the following reports which were marked “to follow” on the agenda for the above meeting:

5. Planning Applications and Unauthorised Development for Consideration by the Committee (Pages 3 – 8)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings
Democratic Services Officer
East Herts Council
peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

MEETING : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD
DATE : WEDNESDAY 12 NOVEMBER 2014
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 12 November 2014

Summary of additional representations received after completion of reports submitted to the committee, but received by 5pm on the date of the meeting.

Agenda No	Summary of representations	Officer comments
<p>5a 3/14/1448/FP Land off Green End, Braughing</p>	<p>One additional letter of objection has been received which raises similar issues to those already covered in the report.</p>	<p>No changes to the report.</p>
<p>5b 3/14/1058/FP Mill Farm, Mentley Lane Great Munden</p>	<p>DCLG have advised that they have received a request from a local resident for the application to be called-in by the Secretary of State for a decision. They will consider this application in the event of a resolution to grant permission and ask that the decision notice not be issued until they have confirmed whether or not it is called in/</p> <p>A number of further representations have been received following the submission of the Sequential Analysis study. Some of these reiterate objections made previously. There are therefore a total of 83 letters of objection and 7 in support</p>	<p>Officers recommend that, if Members are minded to grant planning permission, that the decision notice will not be issued until the confirmation of the Secretary of State has been received in respect of any call-in.</p> <p>These further representations raise similar issues to those contained in the report. No new planning matters are raised.</p>

<p>5c 3/13/2223/FP, High Road, High Cross</p>	<p>A Stage One Highway safety audit has been undertaken. The only safety issue identified relates to a road gully which does not collect channel water flow. No other safety issues with regards to the existing carriageway were identified.</p> <p>Four representations from local residents have been received which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The concerns previously raised and the reasoning behind the deferral of the applications have not been addressed – the development remains unacceptable in terms of density and overdevelopment of the site; - The development will continue to result in an impact on highway safety and access; - The development remains out of proportion with the village; - Loss of parking along High Road; - Impact on setting of listed buildings; - Insufficient space for planting; 	<p>The road safety audit has been undertaken by the Highways consultant, Opus.</p> <p>The audit identifies one highway safety issue which relates to a deficient gully to the north of the access. The works to the access which form part of this application will form part of the S278 agreement, which will incorporate relocation of this gully.</p> <p>Having regard to the findings of the highway safety audit and the comments from County Highways Authority, Officers are of the opinion that the development is acceptable in highway safety and access terms.</p> <p>The comments made are noted and are addressed in the Officer delegated report. In relation to the play space please note Officers recommendation below in response to the Landscape Officer comments. Officers note the comments from the Landscape Officer and acknowledge that the play equipment as currently proposed forms a particularly formal layout. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the relationship with boundaries of the site and existing and future neighbours is reasonably close. As such and, having regard to the comments from the Landscape Officer and third party representations, it is recommended that condition 17 as set out in the Officer Committee Report, be amended to require</p>
---	--	--

<p>5c 3/13/2223/FP, High Road, High Cross</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Play space is in close proximity to neighbouring properties and will result in noise and disturbance to existing properties. <p>The Landscape Officer has commented on the amended scheme and proposed LEAP and considers that an increase in useable open space which includes provision for play is a potential benefit and improvement to the overall landscape quality and character of the proposed development.</p> <p>The Landscape Officer is of the view that, rather than a formally laid out LEAP space that consideration should be given to a Local Landscaped Area of Play. This may reduce the number of play equipment but would be imaginatively designed and contoured, using as far as possible natural materials such as logs or boulders which create an attractive setting for play. Planting should be included to provide a mix of scent, colour and texture. A Landscaped Area for Play should be designed to provide a suitable mix of areas for physical activity and areas for relatively calm relaxation and social interaction, intended in the context of play for use by children and young people alike.</p>	<p>the submission of further details in relation to the play equipment.</p> <p>The submission of further information in relation to the LEAP will allow a greater level of consideration in respect of the boundary treatment and landscaping between the LEAP and existing residential properties. Officers are of the opinion that, subject to appropriate boundary treatment and play equipment that the proposed LEAP will not result in a significant impact on the amenity of existing residential dwellings in terms of noise and disturbance.</p>
---	---	---

<p>5d 3/14/0817/FP Bishop's Stortford College</p>	<p>The Council has been copied in to a letter from the College to the occupants of numbers 6, 7 and 8 Pye Gardens, together with the occupants of 12 Maze Green Road. The letter encloses an extract from the Design and Access Statement that indicates the size and design of the oriel windows, and how the amendments made overcome concerns of loss of privacy.</p> <p>The occupants of number 6 Pye Gardens have raised concerns with regard to two measurements made in the Committee Report. The initial measurement is that of the closest point between the girl's boarding house and the boundary with this neighbouring dwelling. The neighbours disagree that this measurement is correct in stating that the distance is in fact 10 metres. The second measurement is the length of the girls boarding accommodation, which the report states at 38 metres. The neighbour acknowledges that three-storey element is 38 metres, but the total length of the building, including the 2 storey common room, is 49 metres.</p> <p>The occupants of number 16 Dane Park raise concerns with regard to highway safety due to traffic generation on estate roads, such as Dane Park, resulting from the development.</p>	<p>Officers have taken these amendments into consideration in the Committee report.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge that, in taking the common boundary as the middle of the stream, the distance separating the girls boarding accommodation is 12.5 metres, not 15 as stated in the report (which is the measurement between the boarding house and the neighbouring fence). However, the essential distance of 25 metres separating this neighbouring dwelling with the girl's boarding house remains at 25 metres as stated in the report.</p> <p>With regard to the length of the girls boarding accommodation, Officer's concur that the total length of this building is 49 metres, and the 38 metres as detailed in the report refers only to the 3 storey element.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge that some existing College traffic may use Dane Park as part of a circular route for access to the College. However, the application is not to increase the number of pupils and therefore the number of vehicle movements should not increase as a result of this development. It is noted</p>
--	---	---

		that County Highways did not object to this proposal.
5e 3/14/1408/FP Crane Mead, Ware	<p>The Councils Legal section have commented that the life of the viability assessment needs to be time limited and a further viability assessment required to re-assess the level of affordable housing if the current viability assessment expires. This is particularly important as the amount of affordable housing is very low.</p> <p>Officers understand that a letter from the applicant has been circulated to Members. This states that significant changes have been made to the scheme since the last refusal and comments that the scheme provides a meaningful contribution towards housing shortfall, provides a significant level of employment provision, provides improved pedestrian links, acceptable highway impacts and parking with a Management Plan, design and layout is in keeping and a minimum of £245,729 in the S106 Agreement.</p>	<p>Officers therefore recommend that the legal agreement includes a mechanism for reviewing the financial viability assessment should the development not commence within 18 months of the Committee resolution.</p> <p>The comments made are noted and are already addressed in the Officer delegated report</p>
5f 3/14/0209/FO Cintel Site, Watton Road	County Highways have advised that a road closure will be required and a mobile crane licence to carry out the work to the Nursery Roof. The applicant indicates that it is their intention for the crane to be in place over a bank holiday and weekend when the road is quieter.	Noted.

	Ware Town Council confirm their objection to the proposal due to the impact on town centre shopping.	Officers have addressed this matter in the report.
5g 3/14/1626/FO Henry Moore Foundation	Further to the comments received from County Highways, the applicant has confirmed that they are prepared to include a commitment within the construction traffic management plan (as yet not approved re condition 9 on 3/13/2036/FP) that no weddings will take place at the same time as the construction works for the extensions to the existing building.	Officers are satisfied with this approach.
5i 3/14/1283/FP Kenton House Hare Street		Officers recommend that reason for refusal 2 should include reference to policy EDE2 in addition to GBC9.
5j 3/14/1381/FO 3/14/1633/FO Long Croft Monks Green Farm	<p>A letter of representation from a local resident has been received which can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The dwelling at Longcroft is itself unauthorised - The Council are being inconsistent as the resident was denied the use of the 1st floor of his garage for similar uses - Concern as to how this can be policed 	<p>The Council have previously confirmed that the dwelling at Longcroft does not appear to have been sited in accordance with the planning permission granted for it, and is not therefore authorised by that permission. However, the property was constructed in 2006 and is now lawful in planning terms.</p> <p>Officers gave pre-application advice to this resident about the use of the first floor of their garage but this was not a formal application. Officers are satisfied that decisions are being taken consistently and that the use of the 1st floor of the garage can be investigated and enforced against if necessary.</p>