

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

### Date: 11<sup>th</sup> 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.</p> <p>Thundridge is referred to as 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 Council's 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>

	Insufficient detail has been provided regarding heritage impact	application is determined on its individual merits and level of harm as assessed in the officer report.  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.
--	---	--

**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	Additional text added and text varied as underlined below:  9.11 The site is located adjacent to High Cross which is categorised as a <u>group 2</u> 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.

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. In 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. <b><u>Reserved matters applications pursuant to this permission</u></b> 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>
--	--	---