

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 20 June 2018

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 3/18/0432/FUL Northgate End, Bishop's Stortford</p>	<p>A resident has circulated a letter (dated 14 June 2018 and circulated on 19 June 2018) to all committee members setting out objections to the proposals primarily on the basis of transport and traffic related issues but also relates to impact on the character and appearance of the area and air quality matters. A supplementary email was sent 20.6.18 at 14:09.</p> <p>A submission (dated 14 June 2018) has been emailed to members of the committee in objection to the proposals, raising the same range of issues as those set out and summarised in the report.</p> <p>A Yew Tree Place resident has made a further submission setting out a concern that works to the current culvert may result in further delay to water</p>	<p>These matters have been addressed in the report and it is not considered that further comment is required.</p> <p>These matters have been addressed in the report and it is not considered that further comment is required.</p> <p>Proposed conditions require the submission of details of the works which will comprise the opening up of the culvert. Through this submission, consideration can be given to</p>

	<p>draining from Yew Tree Place and, as a result, a flood risk. The resident also sets out that the route of the culvert also comprises a currently undesignated footpath leading from Yew Tree Place (via gated access) to the Meads and Bryan Road.</p> <p>Three further submissions have been received from residents raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration separately from proposals relating to land south of Link road; - Impact on Conservation Area - Traffic generation; - Question the need for additional parking; - Loss of trees and green space; - Pollution; - Impact on residential amenity; - Need for revised reports demonstrates undue haste with regard to the proposals. <p>A further submission made on behalf of local residents by Birketts LLP and emailed to all Members on 19 June raised the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on character and appearance of conservation area, wider setting of Waytemore Castle and non-designated heritage assets; 	<p>ensuring that the works do not have the result of delaying the draining of surface water or of preventing any previously available access for residents.</p> <p>These matters have been addressed in the report and it is not considered that further comment is required.</p> <p>These matters have been addressed in the report and the comments from consultees are provided in the report. It should be noted that the highway authority has not objected to the proposal on safety grounds.</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unacceptable permanent impact on residential amenity due to additional traffic, visual impact, loss of light, impact on privacy, unacceptable noise and air quality impacts; - Threat to trees; - Highway authority objects on highway safety; - Archaeological impact; - Environmental and biodiversity impacts <p>The consultant on behalf of Waitrose submitted a further letter on 19 June 2018 advising they continue to have significant concerns over the capacity of the proposed highway arrangements and if the Committee were minded to grant then a condition be included requiring the future performance of the highway alterations to be monitored and remedial action taken if the highway alterations are not acceptable.</p> <p>The occupants of 14a Northgate End submitted legal advice they received.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted comments from their noise consultant. The noise consultant advises that the difference in sound levels between the front of the site and the rear of the site would be 5dB. The noise</p>	<p>The condition requested is not precise and therefore does not meet the test for imposing a planning condition.</p> <p>Council's legal manager has provided Members with a response.</p> <p>No changes to the report or conditions are proposed.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>consultant has advised that they consider the difference in background noise levels will not significantly affect the conclusions of the noise assessment.</p>	
<p>5b 3/17/0645/FUL 306-310 Ware Road</p>	<p>Councillor Andrew Stevenson (HCC) objects to the proposal and considers that the development is wholly inappropriate for Ware Road, due to its intrinsic traffic limitations and severe congestion problems on the A414, that will not be relieved until a Hertford bypass has been built. Highways objections are constrained by localised legislative restrictions that has meant that cumulative effects of development have not been taken into account. The congestion in Hertford is completely unacceptable and unsustainable already, and Ware Road is in the front line of A414 diversionary traffic. The reality is that the development would add significantly to pressure on Ware Road. There is no residents parking scheme and the planning track record from The Old Police Station development shows that there will be parking overspill that will adversely affect road safety and congestion. In the absence of clear investment in sustainable travel routes, new residents will add to the stress on Ware Road. Every new development needs to contribute £50,000 per dwelling</p>	<p>Refer to report paragraphs 5.1 and 8.12 to 8.17 and the recommended legal agreement at paragraphs 9.2 and 9.3. The proposal would contribute £39,000 towards sustainable transport</p>

	<p>to invest in infrastructure to offset cumulative stress. This site does not sustainably support more than 10 dwellings until such time as there are both sustainable travel Town schemes and a Hertford bypass.</p> <p>Officers are aware that the applicant's agent has circulated a briefing note to Members.</p> <p>3 additional representations have been received from residents objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic generation and parking issues • Potential for surface water run-off and flooding 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to report paragraphs 8.12 to 8.17. Refer to report paragraphs 8.23 and 8.24.</p>
--	--	---