

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Management  
Committee.

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 15 September 2017

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Management  
Committee agenda.

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 13 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Please find attached the Additional Representations Summary as circulated by the Head of Planning and Building Control prior to the meeting in respect of the following:

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](mailto:peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk)

**MEETING** : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
**VENUE** : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD  
**DATE** : WEDNESDAY 13 SEPTEMBER 2017  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

### Date: 13<sup>th</sup> September 2017

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
<b>5b, Land off Luynes Rise, Buntingford</b>	<p>Westmill Parish Council object to the proposal on grounds summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further growth would be over-development of the small market town</li> <li>• Basic support services are inadequate</li> <li>• Traffic survey submitted in 2014 is out of date and new large developments have created a significant additional volume of traffic on the A10</li> <li>• The A10 at its junction with the Westmill turnings has suffered increases in traffic volumes and accidents. This will increase if more development is permitted</li> <li>• Infrastructure in Buntingford is not sustainable to cope with additional population growth</li> </ul>	

	<p>19 additional responses have been received from residents reiterating points of objection included in the report.</p>	<p>Members are advised that the appeal for land North of Park Farm Industrial Estate was allowed on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2017 (see table on p. 62). This has granted permission for a further 43 dwellings in Buntingford, with the loss of approximately 1.1 hectares of employment land.</p>
<p><b>5e, Area 2 South Hare Street Road, Buntingford</b></p>	<p>1 further letter of objection has been received raising concerns over drainage, highway impacts and overdevelopment of Buntingford.</p> <p>In respect of Secured by Design and paragraphs 6.12 and 10.7 of the report, the applicant advises that full accreditation is only being offered to the Affordable housing, not the entire site as suggested.</p> <p>Following discussions with the Highway Authority and applicant, Officers recommend amended wording to Conditions 6 and 7. The previous wording was considered to be unduly restrictive in</p>	<p>These issues are addressed in the report.</p> <p>Officers do not consider this to affect the balance of considerations. There is no policy requirement to achieve full accreditation of Secured by Design.</p> <p>The amended wording is recommended as follows: 6. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular areas, including (but not limited</p>

	<p>terms of requiring completion of all highway works prior to first occupation.</p>	<p>to) internal access roads, forecourts, garages, carports and external parking spaces serving that dwelling, have been surfaced, made accessible, and marked out (where applicable) in accordance with the submitted drawing 17672/1001 F, and carried out in a manner to the Local Planning Authority's approval. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.</p> <p><u>Reason</u> So as to ensure satisfactory parking of vehicles outside highway limits and to minimise danger, obstruction, and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the premises.</p> <p>7. No dwelling shall be occupied until the carriageway and footway visibility splays at internal road junctions and individual dwelling accesses that serve that dwelling, have been provided in accordance with drawing number 17672/1001 F. Visibility</p>
--	--	---

		<p>splays shall be maintained in perpetuity, and within these splays there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6 metres and 2.0 metres above the footway level.</p> <p><u>Reason</u> To provide adequate visibility for drivers entering or leaving junctions and accesses within the site.</p>
<p><b>5f Goods Yard, Bishop's Stortford Rail Station</b></p>	<p><b>From Councillor Gary Jones</b></p> <p>1. There is no mention of the approval of the Bishop's Stortford Planning Framework for DM purposes. The BSPF refers to car parking to serve the town centre as well as the train station, which may justify opening a higher proportion of the temporary spaces</p>	<p>The Framework and the Council's development plan policies do set out an ambition for the redevelopment of the Goods Yard site, including a short stay car park. Solum is engaged with the Council in looking at parking and other matters as part of the work on a new master plan. This application is just for a temporary car park that will, in due course, facilitate phased redevelopment of the Goods Yard and it meanwhile offers predominantly long stay parking for commuters. A request for a proportion of the spaces to be offered solely for short stay at this stage will require consultation and</p>

	<p>2. After my intervention with Solum in February, they agreed to retain 120 spaces of the previous third party car park. I checked yesterday and they are still open and signed as part of the NCP operation. These 120 spaces are not mentioned in the report and do not appear in the table at ERPA under columns e, f and g for July 2017. I think these give a current capacity of 676 vehicles (127+172+248+120+9).</p> <p><b>Local Lead Flood Authority</b></p> <p>Works within the channel to address the current issues for discharging surface water have not been undertaken yet. The LLFA therefore still have outstanding issues on flood risk grounds. No land drainage consent has been given or is subject to a pending application to date. They therefore request condition 4 be amended to add the words:</p>	<p>negotiation that would further delay the opening of the car park.</p> <p>ERP A shows the number of spaces available if the planning application is approved (columns e-g) with the situation in February (columns b-d) before the closure of the third party car park for comparison purposes. Columns were not added to show the number of spaces in use now because it is an interim situation that will change – the 120 spaces referred to will be closed with the opening of the new temporary car park, if planning permission is granted. (The heading to columns e-g would have been better as “Proposed” rather than July”).</p> <p>It is recommended that the condition is amended as suggested.</p>
--	---	---

	<p><i>The submitted details should include surface water drainage figures that demonstrate that the 1 in 30 return period rainfall event will be contained within the system and that the 1 in 100 + 20% for climate change allowance will be contained on site and will have no impact on the surrounding. If there will be informal flooding within the site, these areas need to be identified on a development layout plan, showing the extent and depth of the flooding and under what rainfall event the flooding will occur.</i></p> <p><b>Additional public representation</b></p> <p>A member of the public has expressed their concern about the works to the existing watercourse that appeared to have caused some localised flooding and affected the health of a tree with its roots in waterlogged ground. They suggest the applicant should have used permeable surfacing for the car park.</p>	
--	---	--