

## MUCH HADHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Fiona Forth  
Clerk of the Council  
Tel: 01279 861869  
e-mail: [fionaforthmhpc@gmail.com](mailto:fionaforthmhpc@gmail.com)

40 Calverley Close  
Bishop's Stortford  
Herts  
CM23 4JJ

Notice is hereby given that the meeting of the Much Hadham Parish Council **Planning Committee** will be held on **Tuesday, 2 October 2018**, in the **Green Tye Mission Hall**, following the closure of the Much Hadham Parish Council meeting, for the purpose of transacting the business set out in the Agenda below, and you are hereby summoned to attend.

*FMForth*  
Fiona Forth  
Clerk of the Council

27 September 2018

### A G E N D A

- 18/107. Apologies for absence
- 18/108. Declarations of Interest
- 18/109. Chair's announcements
- 18/110. Minutes of the last meeting held on 4 September 2018
- 18/111. Reports on outstanding matters
- 18/112. Decisions issued by East Herts Council:
- (i) Permissions granted:
    - 3/18/1487/HH and 3/18/1488/LBC - Demolition of garaging/utility area, 1980's glazed link, shed and kennels; construction of single and 1 half storey extensions with new bridge between existing first floors, alterations to converted stable block, and new detached external store; new rooflights and first floor window opening on West elevation at Palace Bothy Winding Hill Much Hadham
    - 3/18/1802/HH and 3/18/1803/LBC - Erection of an open fronted car port at Wenlock House Moor Park Place Much Hadham
  - (ii) Permission refused:
    - 3/18/1560/HH - Demolition of conservatory; proposed ground floor and basement rear extension; new first floor window openings and alterations to fenestration (amendment to previous approval 3/18/0529/HH) at Oakleigh Cottage Kettle Green Lane Much Hadham
  - (iii) Application withdrawn:
    - None
- 18/113. Planning enforcement
- 18/114. Residents' comments on current planning applications and appeals
- 18/115. Planning appeals
- None

18/116. Current Planning Applications for Committee to consider:

3/18/1517/FUL - Proposed erection of 3 dwellings at The Horseshoe Widford Road Much Hadham

3/18/1884/LBC - Retrospective consent for the removal of two internal walls between the kitchen and breakfast room, landing and study, the conversion of an adjoining outbuilding to a cloakroom, the building of a new garage within the curtilage, together with insertion of two windows to the Grade II Listed barn at Bucklers Hall Bucklers Hall Road Perry Green

3/18/1923/HH - Proposed infill extension to courtyard and insertion of 2 rooflights at Grey Mill Widford Road Much Hadham

3/18/1962/HH - Proposed part single storey / part two storey side and rear extensions incorporating a first floor side Juliette balcony, with alterations to include new first floor side and front dormers and new rooflights at Clare Cottage Danebridge Lane Much Hadham

3/18/2054/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and rear garage; erection of replacement 4 bed dwelling with connected garage at Kesten Station Road Much Hadham

3/18/2075/HH – Erection of detached single storey annexe at 7 Windmill Way Much Hadham

18/117. Date of next meeting – Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018 at Much Hadham Village Hall



## 18/112. DECISIONS ISSUED BY EAST HERTS COUNCIL

### (i) Permissions granted:

3/18/1487/HH and 3/18/1488/LBC - Demolition of garaging/utility area, 1980's glazed link, shed and kennels; construction of single and 1 half storey extensions with new bridge between existing first floors, alterations to converted stable block, and new detached external store; new rooflights and first floor window opening on West elevation at Palace Bothy Winding Hill Much Hadham

3/18/1802/HH and 3/18/1803/LBC - Erection of an open fronted car port at Wenlock House Moor Park Place Much Hadham

### (ii) Permissions refused:

3/18/1560/HH - Demolition of conservatory; proposed ground floor and basement rear extension; new first floor window openings and alterations to fenestration (amendment to previous approval 3/18/0529/HH) at Oakleigh Cottage Kettle Green Lane Much Hadham

### (iii) Applications withdrawn:

None.

## 18/113. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

No additional matters to report.

## 18/114. RESIDENTS' COMMENTS ON CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS

### 3/18/2075/HH 7 Windmill Way

A resident highlighted that this was the 4th application to be made at this address and outlined the detail of the previous applications. The concern was raised that there is insufficient parking on the property which could result in parking in the public right of way to the rear, and this could set an unacceptable precedent. The site is in the rural area beyond the Green Belt, where there is a presumption against residential development.

## 18/115. PLANNING APPEALS

None.

18/116. CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

(i) Support given to the following applications:

3/18/1884/LBC - Retrospective consent for the removal of two internal walls between the kitchen and breakfast room, landing and study, the conversion of an adjoining outbuilding to a cloakroom, the building of a new garage within the curtilage, together with insertion of two windows to the Grade II Listed barn at Bucklers Hall Bucklers Hall Road Perry Green

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to support this application.

3/18/1923/HH - Proposed infill extension to courtyard and insertion of 2 rooflights at Grey Mill Widford Road Much Hadham

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to support this application.

3/18/1962/HH - Proposed part single storey / part two storey side and rear extensions incorporating a first floor side Juliette balcony, with alterations to include new first floor side and front dormers and new rooflights at Clare Cottage Danebridge Lane Much Hadham

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to support this application.

(ii) Objections raised on the following application:

3/18/1517/FUL - Proposed erection of 3 dwellings at The Horseshoe Widford Road Much Hadham

The basis of the objection is detailed in Appendix A.

<b>Vote:</b>	For	Cllrs I Hunt; C Thompson and K Twort
	Against	Cllrs W Compton and B Morris
	Abstain	No-one

A recorded vote was requested by Cllr W Compton.

3/18/2075/HH – Erection of detached single storey annexe at 7 Windmill Way Much Hadham

Objection on the basis that:

- there is a lack of parking;
- results in a loss of parking space compared to the previously approved garage proposal; and
- the additional space requirement would be better achieved by extending the property residence.

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to object to this application.

(iii) Neutral view on the following applications:

3/18/2054/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and rear garage; erection of replacement 4 bed dwelling with connected garage at Kesten Station Road Much Hadham

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to be neutral on this application. The Clerk advised that, separately, a resident's comments received by Cllr I Hunt on this application would be uploaded to the EHC planning applications website.

(iv) Noted the following applications (permitted development):

None.

18/117.DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018, in the Much Hadham Village Hall, Green Room, following the close of the Much Hadham Parish Council meeting.

---

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9:49 pm

**3/18/1517/FUL** - Proposed erection of 3 dwellings at The Horseshoe Widford Road Much Hadham

Much Hadham Parish Council objects to this planning application. The site was part of a larger site promoted by the applicant landowner following the Call for Sites for the SLAA in 2015 (Ref 33/012). It was rejected by EHC with the comment:

"The site is poorly related to the existing village and is therefore unsuitable."

This continues to be the case, so there is no reason to change that conclusion.

Objections based on:

**EAST HERTS LOCAL PLAN SECOND REVIEW 2007**

1. The site is within the Rural Area Beyond The Green Belt, outside the Category 1 Much Hadham village boundary. Under the Plan policies for other settlements and villages (OSV), there is an objective to prevent coalescence of villages. Linear development such as that proposed here undermines this objective and opens up the possibility of land either side of this site being subject to development, substantially extending the built form of the village all the way to Bourne Lane.
2. GBC2 prohibits inappropriate development in a rural area such as this.
3. GBC3 lists the exemptions to GBC2. This proposal for 3 large houses does not fall into any of the exemption categories. In particular, there is no exemption for "limited infill" in this rural area.
4. GBC14 seeks to protect the area's Landscape Character by requiring proposals to demonstrate how the landscape will be improved and conserved.
5. The site falls within Landscape Character Area 87 Middle Ash Valley, characterised by a flat narrow valley floor and wetland vegetation. Fields such as this have traditionally been used for grazing and is typical of the small irregular size seen on the valley floor, bounded as it is by a mix of tree rows, hedgerows and fencing. Crucially, there are few settlements within the valley floor (the main exception being Malting Lane from Hadham Cross down to the ford).
6. Footpath 29 to the north of the site leads from the B1004 between fields down to the River Ash that exactly match the LCA topographic description. The views in the area are small scale, contained by vegetation and landform and the view across this field from the B1004 is exactly typical. The landscape elements are "unified, tranquil and coherent" – everything that an estate of large executive homes is not. "This is one of the most traditional and picturesque river valleys in Hertfordshire.....with a wooded farmland character that differentiates it...." (LCA)

7. The strategy for this LCA is to conserve and restore – not build. In particular, “resist any development which could permanently damage the local landscape character. In essence, this means any development, as this is an unsettled area.”
8. The local footpaths, lanes and bridleways are hugely important not only to our residents but also to those of nearby towns, such as Bishop’s Stortford, who look to our parish’s green lungs for their access to wildlife, for country pursuits and meeting some wellbeing needs. The walking routes provide attractive access to our seasonally changing arable landscape, our woods, the River Ash, parkland, wildlife, and the conservation areas of our parish. FP29 provides a direct link to the Hertfordshire Way from the B1004.
9. Developments that adversely impact on views from our PROW are considered undesirable. Whilst district policy affords considerable protection to the functionality of our PROW, it is desirable to protect the views from the PROW network too. Building adjacent to this important connector path would harm its character and amenity value.
10. The proposal makes no mention of the landscape character, how it will be improved and conserved, and has no contribution to make to the strategy for managing change within this LCA, all of which is required under GBC14. In that it fails to respect the rural character of the locality, it is considered to be harmful to it.
11. The proposal tries to make the case that this is infill development: “The proposal constitutes “limited infilling” within the Rural Area as the site is adjoined to the north and south by existing residential development and the proposal would only involve the erection of three new dwellings.” It is wrong to say that the site is adjoined to the north by existing residential development. The nearest house to the site’s north boundary, Ashleys, is 84 metres away. It is a matter of fact, not interpretation, that to the north of the site is footpath 29 and beyond that is a greenfield and a field used for grazing horses. This proposal does not constitute infill development.
12. The D&A statement argues that the houses at the southern end of Much Hadham are predominantly characterised by larger detached dwellings set within more generously sized plots. The proposed development has been designed to reflect this less dense grain of development, it says. However, as the site is in the rural area and not the village, the true comparison is with housing further south along the B1004, which is largely characterised by an eclectic mix of smaller cottages and dormer bungalows, with the occasional larger property, all sited along a building line close to the road. A site of three identikit houses in seclusion from the road does not complement the existing pattern and grain of development, contrary to ENV1.
13. These are 4-bed houses. The application makes provision for only 6 car parking spaces. The Current District Plan Appendix – Vehicle Parking Standards requires houses of this size to make provision for 3 spaces each so, in total, 9 parking spaces, i.e. 50% more than has been provided. The proposal therefore fails to comply with TR7 Car Parking – Standards. No provision appears to have been made for satisfying TR14 Cycling – Facilities Provision (Residential), in providing cycle storage facilities.



14. It is not clear that any thought has been given to bin storage and collection. For Unit C in particular, the distance to move bins uphill to the kerbside looks excessive.
15. Egress from the site will be challenging, given the steep slope rising to the pavement. The current splays are inadequate. A right turn will be particularly hazardous as the B1004 speed limit is 40mph at this point and the approach from the south is a blind bend. Cars on the main road will be travelling north at speed around the bend and at times will be faced with a family car across the carriageway trying to gain speed and traction as it emerges uphill from the drive. At night, with no street lighting, a car across the carriageway will not be easily visible to approaching drivers. Similarly, cars waiting to turn right into the drive from the B1004 will be stationary and potentially seen too late by other drivers heading at speed in the same direction.
16. Under ENV1 Design and Environmental Quality “Development proposals..... must be accompanied by a written statement of design and access principles. The statement should include ..... an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the visual quality and character of the locality.” The submitted Design & Access statement carries no such assessment. Nor does it meet another requirement of ENV1: to consider the impact of any loss of open land on the character and appearance of the locality, and on the nature conservation interest or recreational needs of the area.
17. There is mention made of exploring sustainable energy sources but no commitments are made, whereas ENV1 requires proposals to incorporate sustainable initiatives in design, layout and construction methods including energy and water conservation and solar energy as an integral part of the design of the development.
18. The site is adjacent to a Thames Water sewage pumping station, with its noxious odours. Although the prevailing wind is from the west, whenever the wind is from the east or there is no wind at all, the smell will become noticeable for the occupants of the nearest house.

Objections based on:

#### **NPPF 2018**

1. EHC has demonstrated through its Annual Monitoring Report 2016/17 a deliverable housing supply in excess of 6 years. Thus the presumption in favour of sustainable development is not triggered.
2. Even were it to be triggered, it can be shown that the adverse impacts from the application of policies in the framework would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework taken as a whole, primarily because of the development’s unsustainable location and its impact on the landscape.
3. In particular section 5, para 77-79 support rural affordable housing and sustainable development but this proposal fails both those tests and, generally, other rural development as a category is not given any support in the NPPF.

4. In terms of sustainability, the site is a considerable distance from village facilities: e.g. village school and recreation ground 1.15km, village hall and Bull Inn 1.46km, health centre 0.98km. These are further than normal benchmarks for walking distances. The first 250m is a narrow, unlit footway, with no separation from the highway, for part of which the speed limit remains at 40mph.

### **Other Matters**

1. The proposal draws attention to recent permissions granted in other villages and asks for consistency in decision-making. In general, most of the quoted sites abut existing village development, which this proposal does not. Where approval was given in other circumstances, either the site had a plain and unremarkable landscape setting that would not be damaged by development or, at the time, there was not a 5 year supply of land for housing. Neither of these situations apply.

### **Conclusion**

Much Hadham Parish Council objects to the application on the grounds stated above.