

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Tel: 01279 502174
Date: 11 February 2026

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 11 FEBRUARY 2026

Please find attached the Additional Representations Summaries in respect of the following applications:

- (A) 3/24/0284/OUT - Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 36 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access at Land West of High Road, High Cross, Hertfordshire_(Pages 2 - 6)
- (B) 3/25/0917/FUL - Erection of Battery Energy Storage Facility including access works, landscaping and all associated engineering works at Dellows, Ginns Road, Stocking Pelham, Hertfordshire, SG9 0JA (Pages 7 - 12)

Please review these documents prior to and during the meeting this evening.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings
Committee Support Officer
East Herts Council
peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

MEETING : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD
DATE : WEDNESDAY 11 FEBRUARY 2026
TIME : 7.00 PM

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee**Date: 11th February 2026**

Summary of additional representations received after completion of reports submitted to the committee, but received by 5pm on the date of the meeting.

Agenda No	Summary of representations	Officer comments
5A	<p>One further notification of objection has been received from a local resident. Raising the following additional points (beyond those already made by other objectors and summarised in the committee report):</p> <p>High Cross is referred to as a group 1 village when in fact it is a group 2 village. Thundridge is referred to a a group 1 village when in fact it is a group 2 village.</p> <p>Reference made to application 3/23/2414/OUT which was dismissed at appeal in the village of Much Hadham.</p>	<p>This is due to a technical error on the Councils mapping system. The proposal has been reassessed in light of the group 2 status of the village. The application site is not within the village boundary and therefore for the purposes of assessment, neither VILL1 or VILL2 are relevant. The proposal has been assessed against GBR2 as rural land beyond the green belt. The conclusion remains the same in this regard, that the proposal is contrary to the development strategy and this has been set out in the report and weight assigned this harm accordingly. An addendum has been provided replacing the relevant paragraphs in the Officer report.</p> <p>This was a different application for a different scheme within a different village and with a different landscape impact. Each</p>

	<p>Insufficient detail has been provided regarding heritage impact</p>	<p>application is determined on its individual merits and level of harm as assessed in the officer report.</p> <p>Further detail has been provided regarding the conservation team assessment of the impact of the proposal on the setting of the nearby heritage assets. This is provided below.</p>
--	--	---

Table of errata and updates to reports submitted to Committee.

Agenda No	Paragraph No	Updates
5A	4.2	Disregard reference to East Herts District Plan policy VILL1 and replace with VILL 2
5A	9.3 and 9.12	Reference to High Cross and Thundridge as Group 1 villages to be corrected to group 2 villages.
5A	9.11	<p>Additional text added and text varied as underlined below:</p> <p>9.11 The site is located adjacent to High Cross which is categorised as a group 2 village in the Local Plan. <u>Group 2 Villages are generally smaller villages where limited infill development, together with small-scale employment, leisure, recreation and community facilities will be permitted. The Local Plan identifies that this development should take place within the defined village development boundary. As identified above however, the proposal sits outside of the village boundary and on rural land beyond the green belt.</u> Within High Cross there is a primary school, church, village hall and convenience shopping in the Spar in the service station.</p>

5A	9.14	<p>Additional paragraph inserted below:</p> <p>9.14.1 Consideration is given to paragraph 83 of the NPPF which states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Although the site is located outside of a village boundary, it would present the opportunity to enhance the vitality of the rural community and the nearby settlements.</p>
5A	9.57	<p>Expanded conservation comments have been provided as follows:</p> <p><i>‘The significance of the listed buildings lie in their historic dates and individual architectural form and detail. It terms of their settings, in the case of the Church and the School their settings are primarily informed by their position on the road and their immediate grounds, especially in the case of St John’s Church and its Churchyard. The land opposite has no historic association with the Church or the School, although its rural character is attractive and considered to have some contribution to their settings in referencing the historic rural setting and origins of the settlement of which these buildings are a part. In the case of the barn to the south, historically the site appears to have been part of the farmland associated with this building and the associated farm and therefore contributes to its significance, however in light of the farm site, including the barn, having now been converted to a separate residential uses and that the proposed development does not have built form on the area of land immediately adjacent to the barn any impact is reduced. Therefore in conclusion in the case of the above mentioned heritage assets (the other nearby listed buildings being at too great a distance from the application site or screened by intervening development to be considered further) any harm to their settings and significance is at the lower end of less than substantial.’</i></p>

5A	10.8	First item in column should read 'up to 36 dwellings'
5A	10.9	<p>Additional text added as underlined below:</p> <p>10.9 Given the above assessment, officers conclude that the benefits of the proposal, principally housing delivery and affordable housing provision, should attract significant positive weight. Whereas, the adverse impacts arising from the development <u>including its location outside of a group 1 or group 2 village boundary and on rural land beyond the green belt</u> should be assigned moderate negative weight</p>
5A	Condition 2	<p>Be amended to read:</p> <p>2. <u>Reserved matters applications pursuant to this permission</u> shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below:</p> <p>Location Plan PL001 Urban design parameter plan PL006 REV B</p> <p>Land use parameter plan PL003 REV C Proposed site access arrangements H5208-2PD-005 REV A Proposed signalised pedestrian crossing H5208-6PD-001 REV B Flood Risk Assessment ref no. LE23872–HC-LINK-GEN-XX-RP-C-FRA01-P1-Flood Risk Assessment, rev no. P2 Proposed drainage layout HC-LINK-GEN-XX-DR-C-0500 REV P3 CCTV Survey, Land West of high road high cross dwg no.251148 Response to LLFA Comments-High Cross, by Link Engineering, dated 16 May 2025, Report no. HC-LINK-XX-XX-RP-C-0003,version 1.1</p>

		<p>Technical note-High cross, by Link engineering, dated 22 January 2025, Ref. HC-LINK-GEN-XX-RP-C-TN01</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, drawings and specifications.</p>
--	--	---

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee**Date: 11th February 2026**

Summary of additional representations received after completion of reports submitted to the committee, but received by 5pm on the date of the meeting.

Agenda No	Summary of representations	Officer comments
5B	<p>One further objection letter has been received raising the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has failed to show that Dellows is an appropriate location for a 90MW BESS. • The proposed development would have a “major adverse visual impact long term” • The Council’s Conservation Officer states that the proposed development would result in “less than substantial” harm to grade II listed Stocking Farm, and that “it would need to be proven that the same benefits could not be achieved through an alternative site.” • Two further heritage assets are within 300 meters of the proposed site (Longcroft listed at Grade II and the Old 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is addressed at paragraph 6.3-6.29 of the officer report. • The officer report considers the landscape impacts of the proposals at paragraph 6.30 to 6.40. • The officer report notes that the proposals will result in less than substantial harm to the setting of a listed building at paragraph 6.54. With regard to the reference to the need to consider alternatives it should be noted that there is no policy requirement either within the District Plan or NPPF for the proposals to consider alternative sites.

	<p>Rectory), not mentioned by the application or the Planning Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great weight must be applied to all heritage assets under law. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These heritage assets are not mentioned in the applicant's heritage statement as they are not considered to be impacted upon by the application proposals. Given the distance from the site in a different field, as well as intervening vegetation, Conservation officers also consider that there would be no impact upon these heritage assets given their distance from the site. • This is not what the law (or policy) says. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that <i>"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, <u>great weight should be given to the asset's conservation</u> (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance"</i>. The officer report notes at paragraph 7.3 that officers have given special regard to the importance of the listed building as part of the planning balance. This approach is consistent with the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 212. Nonetheless
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of recent Planning Appeals where Planning Inspectors have concluded that the harms associated with the net zero scheme outweigh the benefits. • Recent cases show that the supposed reversibility after 40 years may not apply for heritage considerations, as the landscape can be indelibly changed. 	<p>officers consider that the wider public benefits of the scheme are of sufficient magnitude to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of each of the nearby designated heritage assets and the considerable importance that this carries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers are aware of a number of Planning Inspectorate appeal decisions in relation to BESS applications, as noted within the supporting statements / background information section of the report. The balance of considerations will vary in each application appeal depending on site circumstances and the nature of the application. There will be some similarities but also differences between the application proposals and other appeals. Each application will need to be considered independently based on an assessment of relevant planning issues. • As noted above the circumstances of each application / appeal will vary. Inspectors have been found in numerous appeals to give weight to the time limited nature of BESS / Solar
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has not specified the equipment that will be used for the BESS, so it is impossible to know how much noise will be generated. Noise will be audible 24 hours per day • The cumulative impact on Stocking Pelham visually and audibly would be devastating: this application is the 7th net zero application around the Pelham Substation. • The Planning Report does not consider the possibility that the development could be placed at a greater distance from housing, and particularly heritage assets. • The planning report does not quantify the benefits such as “stabilising the grid” and “storing green energy” for this specific development. • The planning report has ignored the recommendation by the council’s own heritage team. 	<p>developments. Condition 27 requires the field to be returned to its original condition after 35 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental health officers consider that the assumed noise levels modelled in the Noise Assessment are reasonable and that the proposed noise condition is enforceable to ensure that noise from the development will not be audible. • The cumulative impacts of the development have been considered within the officer report for each of the relevant issues. • As noted above there is no policy requirement for alternative sites to be considered. • This issue is addressed at paragraph 6.12 to 6.18 of the officer report. • The conservation officer comments are recorded in the officer report and
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning report attributes “minor adverse weight” within the planning balance, which does not accord with the clearly established legal requirement to give “great weight” to harm that would be caused to the setting of heritage assets. • The report is not precise on what should be achieved by the required mitigation if audible tones are produced. It may not be possible to retrospectively mitigate tones, so they are no longer audible or at all. • The planning report does not consider the cumulative impact of noise on Stocking Pelham village. • The report does not consider the cumulative visual impact of the 6-metre-high development, nor takes account of proposed and planned developments. • The report does not reference the decision to refuse planning permission for a BESS at Crabbs Green a few hundred metres away – at half the size of the proposed Dellows BESS at a similar location. 	<p>considered as part of the assessment of heritage issues at paragraph 6.51-6.54.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed above with regard to NPPF paragraph 212 and the overall planning balance. • As above with regard to Environmental Health officer comments. • As above with regard to cumulative impacts. • As above with regard to cumulative impacts. • The Crabbs Lane application is referenced in the planning history section of the officer report. Officers consider that there are a number of differences between this site and the application site which have resulted in a different assessment.
--	---	---

	<p>Objection letter from Chris Hinchcliff MP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a net-zero energy transition is noted but residents feel that their home is being asked to bear far more than its fair share of the burden of the necessary infrastructure to meet our decarbonisation targets. • In particular, members of Stocking Pelham Parish Council and other residents have raised concerns about the cumulative landscape impacts of these projects and highlighted the potential for other viable sites which could host such infrastructure without causing such an impact on their lives. • Even if a resident may not be able to see multiple sites simultaneously, the cumulative impact of energy infrastructure will undoubtedly be felt by anyone spending even a short time in their home landscape as they repeatedly encounter industrial development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issues raised in the MP letter are covered extensively in the officer report notably the cumulative impacts.
--	---	--

Table of errata and updates to reports submitted to Committee.

Agenda No	Paragraph No	Updates
5B	S106 Heads of terms	The agreed figure for BNG monitoring is £6750.