

Bishop's Stortford 20 20 Vision and Goods Yard Site Brief

Supplementary Notes / Recommendations

Consideration of further comments received from the Bishop's Stortford 20 20 Group Members subsequent to their meeting held on Friday 10th June 2011.

The draft brief that is reported to Members of the Executive on 5th July takes into account the comments and views expressed at the meeting of the Bishop's Stortford 20 20 Group held on 10th June 2011. The amended draft as published to the Executive was circulated to 20 20 Group Members on 15th June 2011. A small number of further comments / recommendations were received subsequent to publication of the Executive papers. These are set out below with officers' responses for Members to consider any further amendments to the draft brief prior to its approval.

Additional Comments

Bishop's Stortford Chamber of Commerce.

Corrections to Page 12. Otherwise changes discussed at our meeting have been adopted and therefore it is accepted.

Officer Response (OR): Corrections noted.

Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation

1. Title. It should read 'Bishop's Stortford 20 20 vision and Goods Yard Site brief.'

OR – Not Recommended - Background papers and comments of 20 20 Group are fully taken account of and incorporated in the final draft. As the document would be adopted by East Herts Council, the suggested title is an update of a previously adopted brief for planning purposes and guidance for developers.

2. Essential Reference Paper 'C'. Item 6 should read – 'but it should **not** become a competitor to Harlow'.

OR : - Recommended

3. Para 6.3 We have concerns about a road linking Station Road /Dane Street with London Road and problems of congestion at the junction with Hockerill Street. We would question the need for 492 units of

EXECUTIVE – 5 JULY

COUNCIL – 6 JULY

residential development when there are a large number of unoccupied flats across the London Road on the old Tanners Wharf site.

OR : Noted - References to the link road and the amount of residential units are set out in the adopted planning policy BIS11 of the adopted East Herts Local Plan, a matter of fact. However under Para 7.7 of the brief the proposed land uses, acknowledges views expressed by the Aspiration consultation exercise in respect to residential proposals and its context covering the current adopted Local Plan and any changes in the future to the East of England Regional Plan. In respect to the link road it is subject to transport modelling and testing.

4. Hotel. This is an excellent location for a hotel close to the railway station and easy access to London .This would question the viability of a hotel on the Old River/ Causeway site.

OR : Noted –The brief includes the proposal for both a hotel and conference centre. However any hotel proposal on the Old River/ Causeway site is a matter for consideration by the council when determining that planning application.

5. Parking is covered in Para 7.2, 9.6.5 and Para 10.6. Shouldn't these be consolidated to avoid contradiction.

OR : Not Recommended. Para 7.2 sets overall parking context, Para 9.6.5 provides details of design whilst Para 10.6 refers to the council's adopted parking standards.

6. Given the recent report H & EO (16th June 2011) that the 2 doctors surgeries are amongst the worst in the country, the proposal for a walk-in surgery within the station complex is very welcome.

OR : Noted.

7. Other related uses. The proposal to enhance the river frontage along this site is greatly welcomed.

OR : Noted.

8. Land Use Linkages and Integration. It is premature at this stage to link this proposal with the Mill Site for which there is no specific plan.

OR : Not Recommended - Reference to linkages should be retained to ensure that the developer can demonstrate how the proposal will impact with surrounding land uses.

9. Welcome the requirement that 'No buildings in the development should obscure the views of St Michael's Church from Hallingbury Road'.

EXECUTIVE – 5 JULY
COUNCIL – 6 JULY

OR : Noted.

10. Traffic, Parking and Access. Suggest that paragraphs 10.1 and 10.2 should be consolidated.

OR : Not Recommended. The first paragraph relates to a Public Transport Study covering the Bishop's Stortford and Sawbridgeworth area whilst the later covers the wider town centre transport matters.

11. Pedestrian/cycle access : What is meant by surrounding area?

OR : This relates to the area immediately outside the development brief site area.

12. Technical Requirements. Para 14.2 Archaeology, last sentence, in our opinion 'should' should read 'must'.

OR : Not Recommended - 'Should' is sufficient in the Development brief document. The Local Planning Authority can also impose a planning condition at the time of approving a development proposal.

13. Para 14.5 Land Contamination: suggest should read "effected to some degree by a number of different contaminants. Ground water and the adjacent river"

OR : - Recommended.

14. Para 14.7 Does not make clear the need for developers to introduce energy saving systems in all buildings.

OR : Not Recommended - The brief requires compliance with the Code for Sustainable Homes, Building Regulations and reference to Central Government Energy Directive. These are sufficient strong messages to a potential developer to address the issue of energy saving systems.

15. Reference for up to 6 storeys height is not acceptable and it should be lowered to no more than 5 storeys.

OR : Not Recommended - The reference is up to 6 storeys which allow a level of flexibility and creative architecture including development of an iconic building which members of the 20 20 Group endorsed at their meeting when discussing the amendments to the draft brief.

16. General There is no mention of Committee's wish to have the developer's plans scrutinised by an independent architect.

EXECUTIVE – 5 JULY
COUNCIL – 6 JULY

OR : Noted - However, If required the council can engage an in-house or outside design expert input or may consider referring the development proposals to Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.