

## MUCH HADHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that the meeting of the Much Hadham Parish Council **Planning Committee** will be held on **Tuesday, 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2025**, in the **Village Hall, Much Hadham**, 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.

*Jackie Westlake*

Jackie Westlake, Acting Clerk of the Council  
Email: [clerk@muchhadhamparishcouncil.co.uk](mailto:clerk@muchhadhamparishcouncil.co.uk)

28<sup>th</sup> August 2025

### AGENDA

- 25/85. Apologies for absence
- 25/86. Declarations of interest and requests for dispensations
- 25/87. Chair's announcements
- 25/88. Minutes of the last meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2025
- 25/89. Reports on outstanding matters
- 25/90. Decisions issued by East Herts Council
- (i) Permissions granted:
- 3/25/0870/HH and 3/25/0871/LBC Removal of existing canopy and addition of porch on rear elevation along with external fenestration alteration including new rooflight, new door, infill of existing opening. Northleys, High Street, Much Hadham
- 3/25/0976/HH Demolition of existing rear single storey extension and construction of new single storey rear extension with flat roof; insertion of new window to side elevation; re-location of side gate and raising of boundary walls 55 High Street, Much Hadham *[this application was not considered by the planning committee as the consultation period fell between the July and September meetings]*
- (ii) Permissions refused:
- 3/25/0847/FUL Erection of stables, creation of new access track and associated landscaping. Retrospective hardstanding. Land At Windmill Way, Much Hadham
- (iii) Applications withdrawn:
- 3/25/1184/LBC Reroofing of the north aisle with terne coated stainless steel St Andrew's Church, Church Lane, Much Hadham
- 25/91. Report on other planning activity to note - nil
- 25/92. Planning enforcement
- 25/93. Residents' comments on current planning applications, including for housing on Land to the rear of Hill House and at Little Dolan's Field, and appeals

25/94. Planning appeals

25/95. Current Planning Applications for Committee to consider:

3/25/0985/LBC Proposed internal and external repairs, including replacement of decayed timber elements, repointing and re-rendering of the chimney, insulation upgrades, window and door replacements and internal layout improvements Kettle Green Farm, Kettle Green Lane, Much Hadham

3/25/1097/FUL Erection of 31 residential dwellings including affordable housing (Use Class C3), new vehicular access off Tower Hill, new outdoor educational classroom, landscaping, public open space and play space, cycle and car parking, and associated infrastructure. Land To The Rear Of Hill House, Tower Hill, Much Hadham – this item is postponed to the October meeting

3/25/1150/FUL Erection of a detached five-bedroom self-build dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping Plot 12B, Moor Place, Much Hadham

3/25/1183/FUL Reroofing of the north aisle with terne coated stainless steel and replacement of rainwater goods. St Andrew's Church, Church Lane, Much Hadham

3/25/1304/OUT Outline planning application for the erection of up to 46 dwellings, including 40% affordable housing, with associated landscaping, parking, drainage and infrastructure, with all matters reserved except for access. Little Dolan's Field, Bromley Lane, Much Hadham - this item is postponed to the October meeting

25/96. Date of next meeting – Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2025 – Much Hadham Village Hall



#### 25/88. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2025 be accepted as a correct record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chair.

#### 25/89. REPORTS ON OUTSTANDING MATTERS

The report on outstanding matters was circulated prior to the meeting.

The following updates were provided:

- land behind Mill Cottages off Windmill Way – a planning application had been refused permission, so this development should revert to planning enforcement for restoration of the grassland
- Jolly Waggoners – planning enforcement closed their file in November as “breach resolved” in that there was no further evidence of it being used for waste storage / transfer. This will be followed up.

#### 25/90. DECISIONS ISSUED BY EAST HERTS COUNCIL

##### (i) Permissions granted:

3/25/0870/HH and 3/25/0871/LBC Removal of existing canopy and addition of porch on rear elevation along with external fenestration alteration including new rooflight, new door, infill of existing opening. Northleys, High Street, Much Hadham

3/25/0976/HH Demolition of existing rear single storey extension and construction of new single storey rear extension with flat roof; insertion of new window to side elevation; re-location of side gate and raising of boundary walls 55 High Street, Much Hadham *[this application was not considered by the planning committee as the consultation period fell between the July and September meetings]*

##### (ii) Permissions refused:

3/25/0847/FUL Erection of stables, creation of new access track and associated landscaping. Retrospective hardstanding. Land At Windmill Way, Much Hadham

##### (iii) Applications withdrawn:

3/25/1184/LBC Reroofing of the north aisle with terne coated stainless steel St Andrew’s Church, Church Lane, Much Hadham

#### 25/91. OTHER PLANNING ACTIVITY

No other planning activity was noted.

## 25/92. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

Covered as part of outstanding matters (Minute ref: 25/89) – nothing further to report

## 25/93. RESIDENTS' COMMENTS ON CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS

With regard to 3/25/1097/FUL Erection of 31 residential dwellings on land to the rear Of Hill House, residents commented

- that the new site entrance would remove too many “school drop off” spaces, and the recreation ground car park is already overflowing at start and end of the school day, so the developers must allow for parking on the development roads, or supply extra parking, and
- there appeared to have been access created to the site from Oudle Lane for investigation purposes, and this access cannot be allowed to become permanent.

With regard to 3/25/1304/OUT Outline planning application for the erection of up to 46 dwellings at Little Dolan's Field, a resident commented that the whole development was unacceptable on many points; being too far from the village and therefore “unsustainable” being only one problem.

*[At this point Cllr D McDonald withdrew from the meeting.]*

With regard to 3/25/1150/FUL Erection of a detached five-bedroom self-build dwelling at Plot 12B, Moor Place Park, several residents objected and made the following points:

- The original developer's plan assigned the plot 12A for community use including allotments, and these works were not carried out, and the current owner was well aware of the conditions on the land when they purchased it from the original developer.
- The promised tree planting was never carried out (*artist's impression from original developer's plans was provided*) and approving planning permission on this application would reward non-compliance.
- The site was never approved for development and should remain a community space including parking.
- Site now overgrown and enforcement largely ignored. The residents now have to pay for the maintenance of the site themselves.
- The applicant was well aware of the original plans for the plot – the land was always intended to be under the management of the “estate” and EHDC should have enforced the planning conditions for plot 12A.
- In 2013 there were s106 monies for the sports pavilion but money for plot 12A was never implemented properly.
- It is an important open space, which breaks up the existing housing development. The space allows light for several residents and enables views of the adjacent fields across the valley to the Blue Bell Woods.

- House design has a very high roof height, would be very overbearing and the windows at the front would cause loss of privacy, overlooking the garden of the property opposite, even though it is the other side of the driveway.
- Many residents bought their house on the basis that 12A would remain an open space.
- All residents share the same concerns and object to the application – the estate is a unique site with historical significance and all buildings are unique.
- The application shows the house plan is not an original design but a replica of an adjacent house, and building a house of the same design would detract from the uniqueness of the estate and it would lose its charm.
- The Listed garden wall would be too close
- It is believed plot 12A has an emergency water tank buried under it, for the fire brigade to use – building over this would be a health & safety risk .
- The builders will cause a danger to the residents, particularly children who can currently play safely.
- The driveway will suffer from the builders’ traffic and the cherry trees lining the road could be damaged.
- There is understood to be a bore hole in or near the site, which could be affected.
- The owners have never done anything to look after plot 12A over the years despite knowing the conditions and ignored the enforcement. No interest has been shown in engaging with residents except for one letter received just recently.
- Concern that if finance dried up, the build could be halted half way through.
- The 2018 planning application was withdrawn and annoyingly it is now back on the agenda. The grounds for refusal for planning permission in 2018 surely still remain today – on heritage grounds, loss of community space etc.

The applicant introduced himself and commented that the building would be architecturally sympathetic to the area. No windows would overlook any neighbours, as only at the front and back. Construction traffic will be kept to a minimum. He plans to move into the self-build with his family and appreciates that the plot is a sensitive topic for existing residents. His company has done many developments in the village and wants to improve the area and believes this self-build will add to the character of the existing development.

25/94. PLANNING APPEALS *(with the approval of councillors, this agenda item was considered ahead of item 25/93)*

There have been no new appeals submitted nor new decisions.

25/95. CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

(i) Support given to the following applications:

3/25/0985/LBC Proposed internal and external repairs, including replacement of decayed timber elements, repointing and re-rendering of the chimney, insulation upgrades, window and door replacements and internal layout improvements Kettle Green Farm, Kettle Green Lane, Much Hadham

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to support this application, subject to approval by the Conservation Unit

3/25/1183/FUL Reroofing of the north aisle with terne coated stainless steel and replacement of rainwater goods. St Andrew's Church, Church Lane, Much Hadham

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to support this application subject to approval by the Conservation Unit

(ii) Objection raised on the following application:

3/25/1150/FUL Erection of a detached five-bedroom self-build dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping Plot 12B, Moor Place, Much Hadham

**Vote:** all Cllrs present voted to object to this application – see Appendix A

(iii) Neutral view on the following applications:

None

25/96. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> October 2025 following the close of the Much Hadham Parish Council meeting in the Much Hadham Village Hall.

---

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.17pm

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 2 SEPTEMBER 2025

**3/25/1150/FUL Erection of a detached five-bedroom self-build dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping Plot 12B, Moor Place, Much Hadham**

Objection for the following reasons:

**Unsustainable Location**

As EHC does not have a 5 year housing supply, the NPPF's "tilted balance" is triggered, which mandates sustainable development unless the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

In the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt, policy GBR2 permits only certain types of development. One of these is for limited infill, provided it is in a sustainable location and compatible with the character and appearance of the rural area. The developers contend this site appears in the street scene as a gap between houses and, therefore, should be considered as infill. By using materials and designs not untypical of modern rural housing, particularly barn conversions, it could be contended that it is compatible, generally, with the character and appearance of the rural area as a whole. [However, see later comments for site-specific comments]

However, the proposed scheme, by virtue of its location in the countryside and outside of a recognised settlement, would be contrary to the development strategy for the District. The proposed dwelling would have extremely limited access to services and facilities via sustainable modes of transport meaning that the future occupiers of the development would be overly reliant on the use of the private vehicle to undertake daily journeys. Therefore, the proposed development would be in an unsustainable location and would not assist in reducing carbon emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies INT1, DPS2, GBR2, VILL3 and TRA1 of the East Herts District Plan 2018, policy MH H2 of the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

**Detriment to Conservation Area**

The site is in the Much Hadham Conservation Area, [contrary to the assertion in para 2.5 in the applicant's Planning Statement that it isn't] and policy HA4 permits development provided it preserves or enhances the special interest, character and appearance of the area.

"The special interest of an area can derive from a combination of many characteristics, such as the historic street pattern, traditional or notable building styles, or landscape features. Important to all Conservation Areas is the visual 'quality of place' they possess. This aspect principally results from the way in which the buildings and public and private spaces relate to each other, together with the inherent quality of the buildings, other structures, landscapes and the public realm." [Para 21.4.2 district plan]

The Conservation Area was extended in 2014 to include "the entire site including Moor Place, its complex of ancillary and curtilage buildings, objects and pasture land from Kettle Green Road to the avenue approach" [para 6.141 of the Conservation Area Appraisal]. This was proposed before the enabling development undertaken after the approval of:

3/12/1075 Renovation and extension of 4 existing dwellings, erection of 4 new dwellings, change of use, alterations and extensions to existing agricultural buildings to provide 7 dwellings, demolition of existing agricultural buildings, associated parking, landscaping and publicly accessible parkland with nature area, and

3/12/1076 for “Change of use, renovation and extension of existing listed and curtilage listed buildings and demolition of curtilage listed buildings”

The development of the Moor Park Place estate within the Conservation Area does not reduce the requirement of future development to observe policy HA4. The special interest of this Area as far as the built environment is concerned would include the eclectic, non-repetitive design of housing, and the openness of the approaches by road and PROW into the site with a carefully phased transition to a denser street scene as it approaches Oak Barn. This proposal unfortunately copies/mirrors the neighbouring Oak Barn, rather than bringing a different but complementary approach, contrary to the building style on this estate. It also closes off the openness of the views into the estate from FP11 to the east and views out of the estate between Dairy Cottage and Oak Barn, with no offsetting public benefit. Thus the proposal creates a detriment to the Conservation Area, in failing to preserve or enhance it, contrary to policy.

### **Site approved for amenity space**

Para 3.5 of the June 2012 Planning Statement that supported the approved 3/12/1075 application refers to “Shared amenity space sited to open out views to the adjacent parkland.” 3.13 continues: “Removing modern agricultural structures from the site, releases areas for communal amenity use and allows for enhancement of views. The appropriate use of landscaping and boundary treatments ensures that amenity areas are in keeping within the rural setting and character of the site.”

The amenity area referenced in the planning statement is captured in the landscape plans that show this plot as being included in the approved drawings GD12/35/Rev2, complete with details of paths, allotments, trees, meadow and visitor parking – in other words, “shared amenity space”. Plans for a private house cannot be said to “preserve” the “special interest, character and appearance” of the Conservation Area, which includes shared amenity space in its public realm, and so would be contrary to HA4.

Furthermore, condition 4 of the decision notice approving application 3/12/1075 required the landscaping of the Moor Place estate development as per approved plans, under which this site was designated as a Communal Plot. From the Google imagery provided by the applicant, it seems that the site was laid out as intended in those landscaping plans by 2020. Since then, the current owners have not sustained the compliance with the approved plans and allowed the site to fall into disuse and become overgrown. It should not be a justification for development that a previous and ongoing obligation has not been complied with. The site is capable of being restored so that the obligation to provide open space in the form of a Communal Plot is met.

### **Hatfield Forest**

The proposal would result in harm to Hatfield Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserve and no benefits which clearly outweigh the harm have been identified. The proposal is contrary to policy NE1 of the East Herts District Plan, Section 15 of the NPPF and Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

### **Planning Precedents**

The attention of councillors and planning officers is drawn to a similar application earlier this year 3/25/0426/FUL, a self-build infill development outside the village boundary on Danebridge Lane, for which permission was refused due primarily to its unsustainable location. Very many aspects of that proposal are repeated here, plus here there are issues around the damage to the Conservation Area too.

Finally, a previous application for this site 3/18/0557/FUL was withdrawn but not before Conservation Unit had recommended refusal as the development of the site within the setting of listed buildings was objectionable *in principle*, regardless of the detail of the proposal.

**Vote:** All councillors present voted to object to this application