

Little Hadham Parish Council

Minutes of the eighth meeting of the Little Hadham Parish Council **Planning Committee** (2011 - 2015 Session) held on Tuesday 7th February 2012 at 8:00 pm in the Village Hall, Little Hadham.

Present:	Mrs C	Chairman
	Mr J)
	Mr R)
	Mr P) Councillors
	Mrs M)
	Mr G)
	Ms W)

Mr B Evans – Clerk, and 8 members of the public.

- 8.1. **Democratic 10 minutes.** There were no comments or questions.
- 8.2. **Absent** None.
- 8.3. **Declarations of interest.** Cllr Mrs Piccolo said that she had a personal interest in the planning application for White Cottage, Cradle End as the property was her home.
- 8.4. **Minutes** of the meeting held on Tuesday 6th December were agreed and signed as a true record.
- 8.5. **Matters arising from the minutes.**
- 8.5.1. **EHC Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA).** Cllr Mrs Piccolo said that there was nothing new to say.
- 8.6. **Neighbourhood Planning** – initial guidance from EHC. Cllr Mrs Piccolo said this arose from the Localism Act. Councils were invited to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. This would operate for the next twenty years giving a vision of how the community would cope with the inevitable growth. The new planning rules would assume planning applications would be granted unless prohibited by the Local or Neighbourhood Plans. The total cost of instituting a Neighbourhood Plan could be £50,000 to £70,000. Cllr Forgham said that this was a suitable topic to raise at the East Herts Parishes Forum. It was agreed that Cllr Mrs Piccolo would write an article for the Parish News and seek information from the parish county and district councillors.
- 8.7. **Planning applications considered by the Council**
- 8.7.1. 2071/11 White Cottage, Cradle End. Garden shed. Considered by Cllr Forgham and Cllr Wells. [Now granted]
- 8.7.2. 2157/11 Church End Farm. Proposed change of use of part of an industrial building (used for B1, B2 and B8) to use as sui generis (processing of End of Life Vehicles) at Unit 7D, Hadham Industrial Estate, Little Hadham, Hertfordshire SG11 2DY. Considered by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and Cllr Gregory. Cllr Mrs Piccolo read a letter that had been circulated to councillors before being sent to HCC. [Appendix 1] Cllr Gregory said that the current application was likely to be withdrawn as the applicant had been advised that it would probably be refused. However this would only happen if the applicant agreed with a revised application being drawn up by his agent. Cllr Gregory thought a new application would be considered relatively quickly by HCC. Cllr Gregory thought the Council should ask some serious questions about what is happening at Church End Farm. When he visited the site it was clear that the plant was already up and running. Considerable sums had been spent on sophisticated equipment. HCC said that the Environment Agency had given permission for twelve vehicles to be dismantled on a trial basis though clearly many more had been

processed. He thought the Council should write to EHC asking how this planning breach was allowed to happen. He thought EHC was reluctant to seek enforcement if there was a 5% chance of an application being granted. HCC referred to enforcement as a 'soft weapon'. Cllr Gregory said that the site owners had been asked to submit two retrospective planning applications. One for the earth works to lower the land for a building larger than that that had planning permission and the other for a factory making metal staircases. This factory was B2, general industrial, use for which there was no planning permission. If granted, this would set a precedent for further B2 permissions to be granted. Cllr Williamson said that he would arrange a meeting with Mr Kevin Steptoe, Head of EHC Development Control, so that Council members could discuss future developments at the site. It was agreed that Cllr Gregory would discuss the matter with a contact he had at the Environment Agency. Cllr Mrs Piccolo asked that the letter be retrospectively confirmed. Agreed.

Action
GW/CP

- 8.7.3.** 1881/11 Unit 4a, Church End Farm. Retrospective change of use of unit/installation of extractor flue. Considered by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and Cllr Gregory. Cllr Mrs Piccolo read a letter circulated to councillors before being sent to EHC and the draft of a further letter. [Appendix 2 & 3]. Cllr Gregory said that the unit had been granted B2 use although HCC and EHC confirmed that A5 permission was required for the delivery service. The original planning consent restricted traffic to the site to the working day excluding weekends. The café made deliveries late into the night including weekends. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed that the two letters be agreed as expressing the views of the Council. Agreed.
- 8.7.4.** 2207/11 Ashcroft House, Stortford Road. Change of use of land to garden/amenity use in connection with Ashcroft House. Considered by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and Cllr Forgham. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed there be no objection. Agreed.
- 8.7.5.** 0014/12 and 0017/12 Hadham Barn, Bury Green. Regularisation of works to include internal alterations, insertion of windows to east and south elevations and external doors to north elevation. One additional window and removal of modern internal partitions. Considered by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and Cllr Wells. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed there be no objection. Agreed.
- 8.7.6.** 0044/12 7, Stable Cottage, Hadham Hall. Loft conversion involving changing the existing hipped roof to a gable construction with dormer window to the rear elevation. Additional rooflight to the rear elevation and 2no. non-opening, obscure glazed windows to the side elevation. Considered by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and Cllr Forgham. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed there be no objection. Agreed.
- 8.7.7.** 0077/12 Barnhurst, Albury Road. Front porch. Considered by Cllr Mrs Piccolo and Cllr Williamson. Cllr Mrs Piccolo proposed there be no objection. Agreed.
- 8.8. Planning decisions received from EHC**
- 8.8.1.** 1801/11 Land adjacent to Home Farm. Erection of 2 no 4 bedroom houses and 1 no 3 bedroom house together with access and associated parking. Refused.
- 8.8.2.** 2062/11 Church End Farm. Change of use from agricultural land to a green waste composting facility. Withdrawn. Cllr Gregory said he thought the owners were considering their options. He said that they had probably been influenced by Herts Highways objections to increased traffic and by over forty letters of objection from local residents. Cllr Forgham noted that numerous letters of objection to the application for new homes in Chapel Lane had helped influence EHC.

8.8.3. 1812/11 Ashcroft House, Stortford House. Change of use of land to residential curtilage and the creation of a tennis court. Refused.

8.8.4. 2071/11 White Cottage, Cradle End. Garden shed. Granted.

8.9. Date of next meeting – Tuesday 6th March 2012.

8.10. The Chairman closed the meeting to the Public and the Press at 8:46 p.m.

Appendix 1

Re. Unit 7d Hadham Industrial Estate, Church End , Little Hadham, HERTS SG11 2DY ELV – Processing Facility

Little Hadham Parish Council has considered the above proposals and consulted with the community. We wish to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposals as follows.

We consider the scale, size & bulk of the proposed unit to be not in-keeping with this area because it is located on farm land and in a rural situation.

We have serious concerns over the noise, pollution and nuisance of car transporters travelling on a daily basis along what is essentially a single track road and the effect this would have on parishioners living in the properties along Church End. Church End is also well used by church goers, horse riders, other drivers, cyclists and pedestrians and it is felt that the safety, especially that of children, will be at risk from the large vehicles visiting the site.

The access at the junction of the A120 with Church End is narrow and at the brow of a hill. We envisage serious traffic problems in this area the implications of which will be felt throughout the village of Little Hadham; the A120 is already an extremely busy road and at over capacity. It is felt that the type of large vehicles used within the 'end of vehicle life' trade will further exacerbate congestion and make the use of this junction very dangerous for those living in or visiting Church End.

We have serious reservations and feel very strongly that a facility involving the de-polluting of end of life vehicles should not be sited in a Category 2 area; furthermore we believe that this type of facility would not conform to Hertfordshire County Council's county-wide plan for the management of waste and minerals and that such a facility adds to the 'sprawl' into the rural countryside.

LHPC together with the community also wants it to be known to the Authorities that the applicant's lack of consultation and engagement with villagers and the growth, essentially by stealth, of this area at Church End Farm are wholly unacceptable and upon this basis the Authorities should refuse permission in this instance and consider carefully all future proposals from this applicant.

As a community we want to, naturally, protect from further detrimental over development an area which we feel is becoming more and more industrialized and we trust that the genuine validity of our concerns will be taken into consideration when your department deals with the above application.

Appendix 2

Re. 3/11/1881/FP – Retrospective change of use of unit/installation of extractor flue at

4a Hadham Industrial Estate, Church End Farm, Little Hadham, SG11 2DY

We write in connection with the above application and confirm that Little Hadham Parish Council, together with the community, has serious concerns over the setting of a precedent if permission is granted for change of use of the above unit to a retail outlet.

Contrary to the statement in documents supporting this application Little Hadham Parish Council has not given this food outlet its approval, in fact LHPC has never been consulted on the matter by the applicant.

We understand that the business is being run as an Indian food delivery and take away establishment and is trading until late at night; we believe this is contrary to permissible business hours allowed at the site, in that, we understand traffic movement is restricted to no later than 6pm Monday to Friday and specifically excluding weekends and bank holidays. The implications which arise from late night, weekend and bank holiday trading include added traffic noise and pollution and nuisance and disturbance to parishioners living

along Church End. It should also be noted that some neighbouring properties are very close to the business premises.

Of particular serious concern is the potential future growth of the “retail aspect” of the site and the sprawl of the “industrial estate”. These points should not remain unchecked as they threaten village life for our community and have a detrimental impact on the surrounding rural countryside.

We trust you will take into consideration, on behalf of our community, the above concerns when making your deliberations in relation to the above application.

Appendix 3

Re. 3/11/1881FP – Retrospective change of use of unit/installation of extractor flue at 4a Hadham Industrial Estate, Church End Farm, Little Hadham, SG11 2DY

At a meeting of Little Hadham Parish Council on Tuesday 7th February the above planning application was revisited. Following more in depth consideration by Councillors, and in conjunction with the letter of concerns already submitted to you by the Council on the 20th of January 2012 we should be grateful if the following objections are taken into consideration when your department deals with this application.

LHPC believes that Cafe Masala is trading as an Indian food preparation/production and delivery business, although we have learnt from parishioners living in the vicinity of the premises that there is an element of take away at the premises too which we believe in itself contravenes any past permission granted to the unit. We ask that this point be clarified please so that we can be sure that those running the business are not in breach of permitted use.

The end product (prepared hot food) is delivered to retail customers and we understand that in order for the business to be run in this way it requires A5 usage, the unit currently has permission to trade under B1, B2 & B8 usage. We ask that this point be clarified please as it appears that the business is being run without the correct permission in place.

A5 usage would allow the premises to run as a hot food preparation and delivery service. Currently the business trades under the B2 permission element previously granted. B2 usage lends itself to industrial processing trades; this model is obviously not an industrial processing business. We have serious concerns over the future “spread” of B2 use to the rest of the site and ask EHDC to consider very carefully any future applications from Church End Farm which involve B2 usage.

We strongly object to the application being submitted under the title of “sui generis”; we understand this to mean that the B2 permission already granted to the unit could be “adapted to fit” this business model. We reiterate that we believe A5 usage to be applicable to this business.

LHPC considers the delivery of the food to areas, outside of Little Hadham, such as Bishop's Stortford and beyond to be in direct contravention of the sustainability aspect of such a business; increased noise and pollution from delivery vehicles are of genuine concern to those living in our village.

LHPC has been informed that the business regularly trades well beyond the daily 6pm (7pm?) deadline, in fact, most evenings the business is running well beyond 11pm including on Sundays and Bank Holidays. LHPC, together with the community of Little Hadham, objects in the strongest possible terms; this practice is wholly unacceptable and we ask EH Planning and Enforcement Officers to take seriously this information and look into the matter at the earliest possible opportunity.

We trust the above objections will be taken into consideration when your department deals with the above application. Furthermore we look for answers to the valid questions we ask on behalf of LHPC and all concerned parishioners of Little Hadham.