

# Little Hadham Parish Council

Minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Little Hadham Parish Council Planning Committee (2015-2019 Session) held on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2017 at 8:00 pm in the Village Hall, Little Hadham.

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Mrs M Wilkinson</b>	<b>Chair</b>
	<b>Mrs E Lloyd-Williams</b>	)
	<b>Mr G Pearson</b>	)
	<b>Mr G Tooke</b>	) <b>Councillors</b>
	<b>Mr N Wardrop</b>	)
	<b>Mr W Wright</b>	)

Mr B Evans – Clerk, and 18 members of the public including District Cllr Geoff Williamson.

**21.1** **Absent** Cllr Hoodless.

**21.2.** **Declarations of interest.** None.

**21.3.** **Democratic 10 minutes.**

Cllr Williamson spoke on the planning application for 18 houses on Albury Road. He said that in the old and proposed Local Plans, The Ash, Little Hadham was listed as a Category 2 village which allowed for limited infill of up to 5 houses. The old Local Plan had expired and the new was with the inspectors with planned implementation in September 2017. Although not in force, this new Plan still carried weight. National planning guidance said that if District Councils did not have a 5-year supply of housing sites then applications for sustainable housing could be allowed. Cllr Williamson said he was willing to answer any questions from residents.

**21.4.** **Minutes** of the meeting held on Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> May 2017 were agreed and signed as a true record.

**21.5.** **Matters arising from the minutes.** None.

**21.6.** **Planning applications considered by the Council.**

**21.6.1.** 0975/17 Land Adj To Stanemedede, Albury Road. Outline planning for the erection of up to 18 dwellings, all matters reserves apart from access. Considered by Cllr Wilkinson, Cllr Pearson and Cllr Tooke.

Cllr Wilkinson read a letter of objection from CPRE. [Appendix 1] She said a number of Albury Road residents had objected as the proposal was for too many houses. She was unable to find anyone supporting the proposal. The new houses would increase the risk of flooding for homes downstream. Cllr Wilkinson proposed the Council should object on grounds of increased flooding risk from the river and sewer, too many houses, building outside the village boundary, increased road traffic and building on the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt. Agreed. [Appendix 2]

**21.6.2.** 1005/17 1 Chapel Lane, The Ford. 2 storey side extension and a first-floor extension at the rear. Considered by Cllr Wilkinson, Cllr Pearson and Cllr Wardrop.

Cllr Wilkinson said she had spoken to nearby residents who generally supported the application as the houses were very small. Cllr Pearson said the increased runoff would increase the risk of flooding for residents. Cllr Wilkinson proposed there be no objection. Agreed – Cllr Pearson voted against. Cllr Lloyd-Williams proposed that the Council write to EHC asking that the issue of surface runoff be dealt with appropriately. Agreed. [Appendix 3]

**21.6.3.** 1156/17 Field to the South West of Appleby, Cradle End. Agricultural shed. Considered by Cllr Wilkinson, Cllr Pearson and Cllr Wright. Cllr Wilkinson said

that the proposed shed was very large – larger than the Village Hall – and was sited in the middle of an agricultural field. Cllr Lloyd-Williams said she had received a number of local objections. Cllr Wilkinson proposed that the Council object on the grounds of location and scale. Agreed. [Appendix 4]

**21.6.4.** 1117/17 11 Capel Court, Hadham Hall. Single storey rear extensions. Considered by Cllr Wilkinson, Cllr Wright and Cllr Hoodless. Cllr Wilkinson proposed there be no objection. Agreed.

**21.7. Planning decisions received from EHC.**

**21.7.1.** 0126/17 Little Hadham Congregational Chapel. Change of use from church to four bedroomed dwelling. Erection of mezzanine level. Installation of lights and solar panels. Creation of basement with Linear basement windows and an external basement stairwell and the creation parking. Granted.

**21.7.2.** 0778/17 11 Capel Court, Hadham Hall. Single storey rear extensions and separate double garage. Refused.

**21.8. Date of next meeting – Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017.**

**21.9. The Chair closed the meeting to the Public and the Press at 8:19 p.m.**

### **Appendix 1 Letter to EHC from CPRE**

#### **Application No. 3/17/0975/OUT**

**Outline application for up to 18 Dwellings, all matters reserved apart from access: Land Adjacent to Stanemede, Albury Road, Little Hadham, Ware, Hertfordshire.**

CPRE Hertfordshire objects to this application.

Development Plan policy for Little Hadham is set out in the East Herts Local Plan Second Review, and this is still the statutory planning policy context for this application, which conflicts with policies GBC2 (Rural Area Beyond The Green Belt) and GBC3 (Appropriate Development in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt). These state that permission will not be given for the construction of new dwellings, except in specified circumstances, which this proposal does not meet.

The Applicant states that the Council does not currently have a five year housing land supply. We accept that this is the case, though there are varying, and conflicting, methodologies for calculating this. Despite the aspirations of developers, however, lack of a five year housing supply does not automatically mean that policies to protect the countryside from development in the Local Plan are rendered null and void and that every application for housing should be therefore be granted.

Indeed, contrary to the assertion in the applicant’s Planning Statement, these policies still carry weight and are not ‘out of date’ as a result of a lack of housing land supply in the District. This fact is confirmed by the very recent ruling by the Supreme Court in the case of Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government; and Richborough Estates v Cheshire East Borough Council and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (case reference [2017] UKSC 37). The Supreme Court ruled that wider policies restricting housing development are not rendered “out of date” when there is a lack of a 5 year supply of housing, and are accordingly not weakened as a result.

Consequently, the applicant is incorrect in stating that the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the second bullet point in paragraph 14 of the NPPF is applicable to the application. Policies GBC2 and GBC3 should therefore continue to be applied by the Council.

Secondly, the Planning Statement has no section on Agriculture, and makes no reference to either Local Plan or national policies within the NPPF which seek to avoid the loss of the Country's best and most versatile farmland. As has been stated by Planning Inspectors elsewhere in East Herts District, these policies should be afforded weight when considering planning applications that would result in the loss of this important economic asset, yet there is no mention of them in the application.

Thirdly, the layout and scale of the proposed development is totally out of character with the historic settlement pattern of Little Hadham north of the current A120, the former Stane Street. This development would in effect comprise a small housing estate, beyond the northward ribbon development out of the village into the countryside.

Finally, the full landscape and visual impacts of the proposal, as recognized in part by the submitted Landscape Assessment, should be taken into account. The development would introduce an urban element into an area of countryside outside the current settlement that is prominent in views from several public vantage points, and even major landscape planting and sympathetic design would not be able to mitigate the adverse impact that would result.

We therefore urge the Council to refuse the application.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Baker CPRE Planning Manager

## **Appendix 2 Letter to EHC Development Control**

**Re. Application 3/17/0975/OUT Land adj to Stanemed, Albury Road, Little Hadham. Outline planning for the erection of up to 18 dwellings, all matters reserved apart from access.**

This application was considered at the Council meeting on Tuesday 6th June 2017. The Council agreed to object on grounds of location, visibility, risk to flooding and increased road congestion.

In both the current and the proposed Local Plans, The Ash, Little Hadham is designated as a category 2 village which allows for limited infill development of a small number of houses. This application is for 18 houses outside the existing boundary of the village which would be a very significant increase to its size.

The houses would be on land which is in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt in which 'the construction of new buildings will be considered inappropriate.' The houses will remove a significant area of good agricultural land from use.

The site is on part of the land that will be inside the proposed Little Hadham bypass and could be seen as the start of developers' ambitions to infill all of the land inside the new road. This is something that residents fear and will be strongly opposed by the Council.

The site is on sloping open countryside and will be in clear view from the church and from the new bypass.

The hamlets of The Ash and The Ford, Little Hadham have suffered from repeated flooding – both from the overflowing river and from run off from the surrounding fields and built up areas. The buildings and roads from this proposed site will greatly increase the rate at which rain water drains into the river. This will inevitably increase the chance of flooding for homes further downstream. The proposed bypass includes measures to try to reduce the chance of flooding, but the new road is some years away and the Council believes that there should be no significant new building in the Ash Valley, until the proposed flood prevention works are in place and have proven to be effective.

Albury Road is a narrow road with poor visibility and numerous cars parked in front of people's homes. The road is already dangerously busy being used by many cars and heavy

lorries on their way to and from the recycling works at Furneaux Pelham. The traffic on the road will not be improved by the bypass.

There is no shop in the village and an infrequent bus service so residents of the new houses will have to use their cars to get to work, take children to school and to access the shops in local towns. Many will use delivery services provided by local shops. The many vehicles to and from the proposed new houses, together with those from the 6 homes on the Lime Kiln site opposite, can only make the traffic more dangerously congested.

The Council understands the national need for new housing but is convinced that this large development outside the village boundary is inappropriate for the hamlet of Little Hadham.

### **Appendix 3 Letter to EHC Development Control**

#### **Re. Application 3/17/1005/HH 1 Chapel Lane, The Ford. 2 storey side extension and a first-floor extension at the rear.**

This application was considered at the Council meeting on Tuesday 6th June 2017 and the Council agreed not to object.

However, The Ford, Little Hadham is very subject to flooding – both from the overflowing River Ash and from surface run-off from surrounding fields and houses. The Council is very concerned about any new building on the flood plain as this will increase the rate of rain water run-off. This is a very small development but the Council asks that appropriate measures be taken to ensure that the increased run-off is not allowed to increase the risk of flooding of homes and roads.

### **Appendix 4 Letter to EHC Development Control**

#### **Re. Application 3/17/1156/AGPN. Field to the South West of Appleby, Cradle End. Agricultural shed.**

This application was considered at the Council meeting on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2017. The Council agreed to object on grounds of location and scale.

The proposed 'shed' is a very large building – larger than Little Hadham Village Hall – and 12m high. It is sited on an agricultural field close to the hamlets of Green Street and Cradle End. The Council believes that the building is too large and prominent for this rural site and would ask the Planning Office to refuse the application.