

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Management  
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 25 May 2017

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Management  
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 24 MAY 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:

6. Planning Applications and Unauthorised Development for Consideration by the Committee (Pages 3 – 6)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings  
Democratic Services Officers  
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 24 MAY 2017  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

### Date: 24 May 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>6a</b> <b>3/16/2847/FUL</b> <b>The Bungalow,</b> <b>Ermine Street,</b> <b>Colliers End</b>	<p>Four additional submissions have been received in favour of the proposals referring to the enhancement it will bring. One submission in objection referring to the scale of the building, the impact on wildlife and the transport impact.</p> <p>A Briefing Note on the proposals has been circulated by the agent acting on behalf of the applicant to all members of the committee.</p>	The additional comments are noted.
<b>6c</b> <b>3/17/0387/OUT</b> <b>Land adjacent</b> <b>the Old</b> <b>Rectory,</b> <b>Baldock Road,</b> <b>Cottered</b>	<p><u>The applicant</u> has submitted a response to the advice of HDC's Landscape Officer summarised as follows:</p> <p>The site has hedgerows and fields on its southern border and cannot accurately be described as <i>'poorly impacting on the eastern approach'</i>; The proposals are not <i>'incongruous to the surroundings'</i>. There are numerous houses that sit away from the road behind hedges and fences;</p>	<p>In relation to these additional submissions the Council's <u>Landscape Officer</u> comments:</p> <p>The submission suggests that there will be no impact on the village due to existing tree and vegetation screening along the southern boundary. However, there is no level of protection for hedges that form part of the curtilage of a dwelling (save for a 5 year hedge retention condition). The</p>

	<p>The assertion that the proposals are a <i>'typical suburban cluster'</i> is not accurate. The proposals will create a proper 'street' or 'village lane' edged by the terraced dwellings that lead to the rural landscape beyond;</p> <p>The proposals carefully reflect and refer to existing buildings within the village;</p> <p>The proposed dwellings will add to the richness to the village which has a diverse vernacular context;</p> <p>We do not agree that the site <i>'is not a natural infill'</i>. The detached dwellings to the east are within the village boundary so are not <i>'out of village'</i> as described. The site is an infill site. It is a gap within the village and does not impact on its setting or form;</p> <p>The proposal is not designed for further expansion. Access to the field beyond is important to allow for 'Cottered Village Day' parking;</p> <p>The development is not <i>'cramped'</i>. The density responds to the local context;</p> <p>The village is a recognised settlement where additional housing in support of its sustainability is acceptable. The proposals strengthen the character of the village;</p> <p>The offer in the S.106 Heads of Terms (HOT) makes a positive contribution to the village;</p> <p><u>The applicant</u> has today submitted additional representations responding to the comments of the Landscape Officer on their representations above.</p> <p><u>The applicant</u> has made submissions countering the objections of the CPRE and Herts &amp; Middx Wildlife Trust and the content of the report.</p> <p><u>The applicant</u> has advised that since they became aware</p>	<p>development represents the loss of an important gap including a connection to the open countryside which will be lost.</p> <p>There is an attempt to compare the proposed development and layout with rear gardens facing the road etc. with The Old Rectory. However, there are no similarities in terms of grain, pattern, scale, mass, form or appearance to allow such comparison.</p> <p>The site is not an infill development. It lies outside the village boundary, as are the nearest buildings to the east. However, the village does extend along the southern side of the A507 to include a few dwellings to the east of Throcking Road.</p> <p>The provision of parish allotments and an honesty shop referred to in the HOT have not been further</p>
--	---	---

	<p>of the Council’s position in respect of starter homes they have been in discussion with registered social housing providers to provide affordable housing to align with policy requirements. An updated S.106 Heads of Terms letter has been submitted reflecting the change to the affordable housing provision and the financial contributions requested by HCC.</p> <p><u>The Highway Authority</u> does not wish to restrict the grant of permission, subject to conditions commenting: The site is accessed from the A507, an A class main distributor. The speed limit is 30mph but surveys confirm that speeds are closer to 40mph. 4 ‘slight’ accidents are recorded 0.5km either side of the access. Following discussions the application has been amended to satisfy highway requirements. <u>The Lead Flood Risk Authority</u> raises no objection to the grant of permission, subject to conditions.</p>	<p>detailed.</p> <p>These are noted by Officers. Nothing further to add.</p> <p>Noted by officers.</p> <p>The change to the affordable housing contribution would be regarded as a material change to the proposal as detailed in the application form and submissions. Should Members consider that this change has merit officers would suggest that consideration of the application be deferred to enable formal submissions and re-consultation. However, in circumstances where refusal is recommended it is normal practice to include a reason (reason 3) that addresses the fact that there is no legal agreement in place. Therefore the recommendation would remain unchanged.</p> <p>To be noted.</p>
--	--	---

		To be noted.