

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL  
CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD ON  
WEDNESDAY 8 NOVEMBER 2017, AT 7.00  
PM

---

PRESENT: Councillor T Page (Chairman)  
Councillors D Andrews, P Boylan, R Brunton,  
S Bull, M Casey, B Deering, M Freeman,  
J Goodeve, J Jones, R Standley and  
K Warnell.

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillors P Ballam and S Rutland-Barsby.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Thomas Howe	- Planning Student
Hazel Izod	- Senior Planning Officer
Peter Mannings	- Democratic Services Officer
Femi Nwanze	- Development Management Team Manager
David Snell	- Senior Planning Officer
Victoria Wilders	- Legal Services Manager

240 APOLOGY

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor M Allen. It was noted that Councillor S Bull was substituting for Councillor M Allen.

241 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman thanked the Legal Services Manager for

her support and wished her well on behalf of the Development Management Committee.

242 MINUTES – 11 OCTOBER 2017

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2017, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

243 3/17/1922/OUT – OUTLINE PLANNING FOR UP TO 40 DWELLINGS ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS ON LAND WEST OF ACORN STREET, HUNSDON FOR BIDWELLS

---

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/17/1922/OUT, planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in the report now submitted.

Officers summarised the outline application and explained that all matters were reserved aside from access. Members were reminded that the site was located in the rural area beyond the green belt and Members would be aware of NPPF policy and the presumption in favour of development.

Members were advised that despite discussions with the developer, Officers still had concerns which had led to a recommendation for refusal. An amended plan had been submitted but this had not been the subject of consultation. Members were further advised that some technical matters might be possible to address but some fundamental issues still remained.

Officers stated that an application for 12 dwellings at 9 Ashes, Acorn Street, Hunsdon had been refused on the grounds of a harmful landscape/visual impact and harm to the setting of listed buildings. An appeal against this decision had recently been dismissed by the planning inspectorate.

Mr Butler addressed the Committee in support of the application. Mr Griffiths spoke against the application on behalf of Hunsdon Parish Council.

Officers confirmed to Councillor R Brunton that the emerging District Plan was under examination and the policies in the plan could only be afforded limited weight. Members should focus on the policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

Councillor P Boylan commented on whether the group 1 village of Hunsdon had a Neighbourhood Plan. Officers advised that they were not aware of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan for Hunsdon that could be taken into account by Members. Councillor R Brunton confirmed that there was no Hunsdon Neighbourhood Plan but a plan might be forthcoming in conjunction with Eastwick and Gilston.

Councillor M Casey was assured by the Legal Services Manager that although he had arrived late he could contribute to the debate and vote as he had not missed the start of the debate. He stated that he had visited the site and had been struck by paragraph 10.3 of the report submitted, in that Category 1 Villages were expected to accommodate at least a 10% increase in housing stock over the period 1 April 2017 – 31 March 2033. He commented that this application for 40 dwellings exceeded the current estimated expectation of an additional 37 houses for Hunsdon at a disproportionately early stage.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the Committee accepted the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Building Control as now submitted.

RESOLVED – that in respect of application 3/17/1922/OUT, planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in the report submitted.

244 3/17/1861/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF SEVENTEEN B1(BUSINESS) USE CLASS UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND ACCESS ROADS AT WATERMILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, ASPENDEN ROAD, BUNTINGFORD FOR DEED (UK) LTD

---

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/17/1861/FUL, subject to a legal agreement, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report now submitted.

The Head outlined the application for 2380 square metres of net employment floor space, 68 car parking spaces and access roads. A majority of the site had been allocated for employment in the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007 and the emerging District Plan.

Officers reminded Members of the lack of employment sites in Buntingford and advised that this fact had to be given significant weight when considering applications for employment use. Members were referred to the late representations summary in respect of the comments of Buntingford Town Council, the Council's Engineer and the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Mr Reeves addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Councillor S Bull commented that one solution to the traffic congestion was to have traffic exiting onto the A10. He referred to the revised drainage strategy and the anticipated re-consultation response due to be reported to Members. He also emphasised that the requested £55,000 financial obligation to include improvements to the Aspenden Road junction was insufficient. He concluded by questioning who would police the discharge of grey water into the River Rib.

Councillor J Jones referred to a significant lack of employment and he was fully supportive of the application due to a dire need for employment areas. He felt that it

was a shame that opportunities to improve design quality had not been taken up. He also commented on the opportunity to improve the footway into Luynes Rise and potential improvements to street lighting.

Councillor J Jones concluded that the applicant should be encouraged to improve the internal estate roads and he referred to the importance of compliance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy T6 and a contribution towards the Buntingford Community Area Transport Scheme.

Councillor D Andrews commented on the dire state of the road network and referred to the architectural elements of the proposed development.

Officers commented that Members could defer the application on the basis of the design. The Committee was advised however, that Officers had not identified sufficient justification to recommend refusal on design grounds.

A number of Members commented on the roads and junctions, the design and layout of the proposed development and whether the application constituted sustainable development. Councillor D Andrews commented that condition 3 could be amended to include a requirement that the estate roads should be brought up to a reasonable and acceptable standard.

Councillor R Brunton proposed and Councillor B Deering seconded, a motion that application 3/17/1861/FUL be deferred to allow the applicant to improve the layout and design of the proposed development.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared LOST. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the Committee accepted the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Building Control as now submitted, subject to condition 3 being amended to include a requirement that the estate roads within the applicant's control should be brought up to a

reasonable and acceptable standard.

RESOLVED – that in respect of application 3/17/1861/FUL, subject to a legal agreement, to include a contribution towards the Buntingford Community Transport Scheme, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report submitted and subject to condition 3 being amended to include a requirement that the estate roads within the applicant's control should be brought up to a reasonable and acceptable standard.

- 245 3/17/1791/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF SPORTS HALL (985M2) WITH ASSOCIATED CHANGING FACILITIES AND CAR PARK, WITH ACCESS FROM STORTFORD HALL PARK AT HOCKERILL ANGLO EUROPEAN COLLEGE DUNMOW ROAD, BISHOP'S STORTFORD CM23 5HX FOR HOCKERILL ANGLO-EUROPEAN COLLEGE

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/17/1791/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report now submitted.

The Head summarised the application and referred to the car park and the planned exit onto Stortford Hall Park. Members were advised of the intended dual community use and the condition requiring that details of this agreement be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in discussion with Sport England.

Mr Bennett addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Mr Markham spoke for the application.

Councillor M Casey commented on ownership of the boundary of the site with Stortford Hall Park. He referred to this being a single carriageway road and highlighted the objections from some residents living on it. He believed that the proposed car park might relieve the

pressure on Stortford Hall Park.

Councillor M Casey also commented on whether allowing students to park on school premises would reduce the impact on student parking obstructing the residential properties on Stortford Hall Park. He referred to the 16 spaces proposed for community use to the north of the proposed sports hall.

Councillor K Warnell expressed disappointment with the design of the proposed development. He considered that better surface treatment was achievable and the sports hall was out of keeping with other buildings already in place on this site.

Officers explained that the applicant had not been able to identify who owned the land between the college and Stortford Hall Park. Officers considered that the design of the sports hall was uninspiring and functional. Members were advised of the proposed soft planting included as part of the application.

Councillor B Deering commented on paragraph 1.3 of the report submitted with particular reference to the requirement for rigorous and ongoing management regarding the proposed access off Stortford Hall Park for the new parking area. Councillor K Warnell commented that, at peak times Stortford Hall Park resembled a rat run with blind bends in a number of dangerous locations.

Councillor M Casey raised concerns about parking in general and advocated that students should be able to use the proposed car park when it was not being used by the community.

Officers reminded Members that conditions had to be enforceable in order to meet the standard tests. Members were advised to be cautious as there was no planned increase in pupil numbers and there would be a benefit in terms of a community use. However, in order to accommodate the parking capacity concerns raised by

Councillor M Casey, it was suggested that, whilst there was no reason to amend the proposed conditions, condition 12 regarding the Car Park Management Plan, could be discharged in consultation with the local ward Members.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the Committee accepted the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Building Control as now submitted.

RESOLVED – that in respect of application 3/17/1791/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report submitted and subject to consultation with the local ward Members in respect of the discharge of conditions.

246 3/17/2118/HH – TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT 1 BEECHFIELD, SAWBRIDGEWORTH CM21 9NG FOR MRS L PAGE

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/17/2118/HH, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report now submitted.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the Committee accepted the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Building Control as now submitted.

RESOLVED – that in respect of application 3/17/2118/HH, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report submitted.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm