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	One further objection letter has been received raising the following issues: • 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	• 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.

	Rectory), not mentioned by the application or the Planning Report	• 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.
	• Great weight must be applied to all heritage assets under law.	• This is not what the law (or policy) says. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (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"*. 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

		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.
	• 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.	• 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.
	• Recent cases show that the supposed reversibility after 40 years may not apply for heritage considerations, as the landscape can be indelibly changed.	• 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

		developments. Condition 27 requires the field to be returned to its original condition after 35 years.
	• 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	• 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 impact on Stocking Pelham visually and audibly would be devastating: this application is the 7th net zero application around the Pelham Substation.	• The cumulative impacts of the development have been considered within the officer report for each of the relevant issues.
	• The Planning Report does not consider the possibility that the development could be placed at a greater distance from housing, and particularly heritage assets.	• As noted above there is no policy requirement for alternative sites to be considered.
	• The planning report does not quantify the benefits such as “stabilising the grid” and “storing green energy” for this specific development.	• This issue is addressed at paragraph 6.12 to 6.18 of the officer report.
	• The planning report has ignored the recommendation by the council’s own heritage team.	• The conservation officer comments are recorded in the officer report and

		considered as part of the assessment of heritage issues at paragraph 6.51-6.54.
	• 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.	• Addressed above with regard to NPPF paragraph 212 and the overall planning balance.
	• 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.	• As above with regard to Environmental Health officer comments.
	• The planning report does not consider the cumulative impact of noise on Stocking Pelham village.	• As above with regard to cumulative impacts.
	• The report does not consider the cumulative visual impact of the 6-metre-high development, nor takes account of proposed and planned developments.	• As above with regard to cumulative impacts.
	• 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.	• 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.

	Objection letter from Chris Hinchcliff MP: • 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.	• 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.