

## Essential Reference Paper 'B' – Additional Representations Summary

### East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 7 January 2015

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>5a</b> <b>3/14/1583/FP</b> <b>Dane O'Coys</b> <b>Road,</b> <b>Bishop's</b> <b>Stortford</b>	<p>The <u>Councils Solicitor</u> considers that more guidance should be provided to the committee to enable it to make a decision in relation to the issue of tenure of the affordable homes to be provided. She is concerned that an adverse precedent would be set if the 100% shared ownership option is selected.</p> <p>Members have been circulated with a communication on behalf of the applicant dated 2 January 2015. This sets out that a further reason for the proposal to provide shared ownership properties on site is to minimise the impact on the owners/ occupiers of the adjacent Hoggetts End property. Those owners do not consider that social rented properties would not be appropriate in this part of the town which is characterised by larger family homes. In addition, it is pointed out that consultation carried out by the applicant locally indicates a preference for the provision of shared ownership homes.</p> <p>Three further responses have been received. Two set out the preference for the provision of shared ownership</p>	<p>Officers consider that the applicant in this case has made an interesting offer, and it has to be properly evaluated, despite the normal policy position, as £500,000 is a very substantial sum that would add to the affordable housing stock.</p> <p>Members are advised not to give significant weight to the point made in the communication circulated on behalf of the applicant or the additional submissions which indicate a preference only for shared ownership properties. One of the communications has set out reasons as to why this is considered to be the case. These are planning considerations, though not strong reasons in this case.</p> <p>With regard to any impact on the visual character of the area, this will occur in any event whether the properties are social rent or shared ownership.</p> <p>In other cases however, the reasons for only</p>

## Essential Reference Paper 'B' – Additional Representations Summary

	<p>properties on the site. One cites location, access, nearby facilities and the ease of management as the reasons for this. One is in objection on the basis of additional traffic, potentially on Whitehall Lane, and additional demand for educational, medical and transport facilities.</p>	<p>supporting shared properties are not articulated in planning terms – they are only expressed as a personal preference. These should not be given weight</p> <p>Members are advised that, if they feel they wish to support the £500,000 funding option, because it is a sound offer in financial terms, they should articulate that the personal preference of those who have commented on the proposals has been given no weight in the determination process.</p>
--	--	--