

From: [David Jackson | IE](#)
To: [David Hodbod](#)
Cc: [Brenda Taplin](#); [Chay Dempster](#); [Brian Owen](#); [Paul Harding](#)
Subject: FW: [External] RE: [External] RE: Hatfield Aerodrome Planning Appeal
Date: 16 December 2024 10:09:26

David

Good morning

So we are on the same page and have the same documentation, can you please give us the latest set of conditions which we need to append the issues alluded to by the inspector.

Of course, a common issue of this inquiry has been the late delivery of consistent documentation.

If we are left out of the process we will simply come back, as we have over the last 8 years.

Best

David Jackson

Representing residents Popefield Farm community group.

From: [David Jackson I IF](#)
To: [Brenda Taplin](#)
Cc: [Paul Harding](#); [David Hodbod](#)
Subject: Re: [External] Hatfield Aerodrome Planning Appeal [GATELEY-GHAM.FID139926]
Date: 18 December 2024 20:29:08

Dear Brenda

Yes I understand.

Not being entirely eau fait with
the councils role we are caught between
our relatively quick and succinct
response and their tardiness.

So Monday nobody at the council.

Last night 8.30pm (Tuesday)
we get the info.

We respond by 10.30 am this morning(Wednesday)

So you imagine within 90 mins in real time.

Now we wait some response from the
council to our concerns on wording.

We got nothing.

We are very sympathetic to what the inspector
requires.

In fact when the opposing barrister called
the procedure like something out of
Alice in wonderland .. he neglected
to factor that some of the participants
don't get any advantage from this going on.
... the inspector wants it wrapped up.

We think our concerns need to
be placed in conditions and all could have
been resolved in 2 days .. not umpteen weeks.
I promise you will get a quick response from us
within 2 hours.

CHG also complain of late reply from the CC.

Best

David Jackson

Sent from my iPhone

From: [David Jackson | IF](#)
To: [David Hodbod](#)
Cc: [Paul Harding](#); [Chay Dempster](#); [Brenda Taplin](#); [Brian Owen](#)
Subject: Re: [External] RE: [External] Conditions - Urgent please [GATELEY-GHAM.FID139926]
Date: 19 December 2024 22:27:27
Attachments: [Hatfield Aerodrome - Conditions 2024_12_19 HCC.docx](#)

David

As we said, we would reply within 2 working hours of getting the latest conditions. This I think we have upheld.

CHG and ourselves are both interested in preserving the listed buildings and community that has quite enjoyment at the site .

We stand allied in rejecting the gravel extraction on this specific site.

Bore holes, noise detection , inclusion are simply a part of the necessity of life when you have 32 years of heavy industry potentially 55 metres from the boundary of a property that dates to Elizabeth 1st or Jacobean.

As inference before we rely very much on an even handed inspector who cannot we believe entirely ignore the previous findings from a fellow open minded professional.

Many aspects of this inquiry involve maximisation as opposed to compromise from the developer and land owner.

Gravel is not so rare , neither is infill.

This site has changed a lot in 30 years.

We are looking at the latest changes to planning regs in relation to this application.

Best

David jackson

Sent from my iPhone

I haven't yet had confirmation from the CHG whether they agree to Mr Jackson's amendment to Condition 75, but so that everyone has these first thing in the morning, I have now compiled everything including a number of suggested amendments from Mr Jackson submitted this morning. I have added red comments to the Inspector's instructions in Brenda's email from 18:45 on 18 December 2024 (below) to show that everything has been addressed, other than the CHG thoughts on Condition 75.

Thanks,

David

From: Simon Treacy <Simon.Treacy@brett.co.uk>

Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2024 10:31 AM

To: Brenda Taplin <Brenda.Taplin@gateleyhamer.com>; David Jackson | IF <david@ifmarketingagency.com>; David Hodbod <David.Hodbod@hertfordshire.gov.uk>; Andrea Bruce <andrea.bruce@knightsplc.com>; CHPC Clerk <clerk@colneyheathparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Cc: Brian Owen <Brian.Owen@hertfordshire.gov.uk>; Chay Dempster <Chay.Dempster@hertfordshire.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: [External] Conditions - Urgent please [GATELEY-GHAM.FID139926]

Dear Mr Jackson

As you can see, we have been asked to contact you directly by the Inspector concerning bullet points 1 and 4 of your email, which I do so below:

Working hours

The evidence presented at the Inquiry did not support a change to the operating hours proposed. The operating hours applied for are not unusual and are in fact common for mineral operations. I have quickly looked at Hatfield Quarry (Cemex) which allows operations to commence earlier at 6am. Permission ref 5/1789-20 (PL/0165/20) (CM0102) granted in 2021 allows working to take place 0600 – 1800 Mon to Fri and 0700 to 1300 Saturdays. Another permission granted in 2023 for another area at the same quarry ref PL\0963\18. LPA Ref: 6/2018/3138/CN (CM0975) allows operations between 0700 – 1800 Monday to Friday, 0700 to 1300 Saturdays.

Site boundary

This is noted and agreed, we acknowledge we do not have property rights over Popefield Farm. During the inquiry it was clarified that no operations were in fact proposed or indeed required over your land.

Regards

Simon

From: Brenda Taplin <Brenda.Taplin@gateleyhamer.com>

Sent: 18 December 2024 18:45

To: David Jackson | IF <david@ifmarketingagency.com>; David Hodbod <David.Hodbod@hertfordshire.gov.uk>; Andrea Bruce <andrea.bruce@knightsplc.com>; CHPC Clerk <clerk@colneyheathparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Cc: Brian Owen <Brian.Owen@hertfordshire.gov.uk>; Chay Dempster <Chay.Dempster@hertfordshire.gov.uk>; Simon Treacy <Simon.Treacy@brett.co.uk>

Subject: RE: [External] Conditions - Urgent please [GATELEY-GHAM.FID139926]

Importance: High

CAUTION: This message originated from an external source. Do not reply, open attachments or click links unless you recognise the sender and trust it is safe.

Hello All

Thank you Mr Jackson for your email to Mr Hodbod below. In view of the time constraints, the Inspector has had sight, and I have tried to compress the various actions the Inspector has directed by including all parties in one email.

Mr Jackson

I have been asked by the Inspector for your confirmation that you have seen the alternative condition 30 at the very end of Mr Hodbod's latest revision to the conditions document (doc attached for ease of reference). If you are not in agreement with it, then either you submit your own revision immediately, or the current alternative included by the Council on your behalf may need to be taken out. **Mr Jackson has submitted his own revision. I have included it in Addendum 3 of the attachment.**

Mr Jackson

With regard to your condition 76, this looks to be the wrong number? Could you confirm that it should be Liaison Group, No 75. **It was 75, this was clear from Mr Jackson's submitted Condition revisions, of which all are included in Addendum 3 of the attachment.**

Mr Jackson & Mr Hodbod

On the assumption that it is No 75, Mr Jackson is, by this email, formally asking the Council if it has any objections to his (Mr Jackson's) proposed change. If the Council does have objections, then Mr Jackson would need to consider whether, or not, to formally submit a revised wording. If the Council does not have any objections, then the Appellant and Colney Heath Group need to be consulted by Mr Hodbod. (Appellant and CHG to be prepared please to respond to the Council's decision). If neither of those parties object, Mr Hodbod should please change the condition. If one of those parties does, then again Mr Jackson, you either need to submit a revised condition or drop your objection. **Neither the MPA or the Appellant object to this amendment. We have not had confirmation from CHG but the modification is included in Addendum 3 of the attachment and I have stated that neither the MPA or the Appellant object to the change for the SoS.**

Mr Jackson

Re the condition of the building. (bullet 3) regardless of the opinions of the Appellant and Council, if you want the Secretary of State to consider the need for such a condition then you need to submit one properly drafted. **Mr Jackson has drafted and**

submitted a suggested condition. The MPA do not think it's necessary and has explained in Addendum 3, but it is there for the SoS to consider.

Mr Hodbod & Mr Jackson

Would Mr Hodbod please respond to Mr Jackson's second bullet point immediately and directly with Mr Jackson. If Mr Jackson's concerns are not as he suggests and cannot be resolved by reference to whatever Mr Dale Harris said, or by an amendment to a condition, then Mr Jackson needs to suggest an alternative or extra condition immediately. I responded to Mr Jackson this morning and based on a subsequent email sent by Mr Jackson, I hope this has given some reassurance that concerns about future legislative changes will be taken into account by the MPA.

Ms Bruce on behalf of the Appellant

I am to ask please for the Appellant to confirm or otherwise bullet points 1 and 4 with Mr James directly. The Appellant emailed Mr Jackson regarding these two points.

Many thanks.

Brenda

Brenda Taplin

Senior Land Referencer & Public Inquiry Programme Officer

for Gateley Hamer

t: [0148 323 0161](tel:01483230161)

m: [07493 972 022](tel:07493972022)

ext: 2302

brenda.taplin@gateleyhamer.com

I work flexibly - so whilst it suits me to email outside normal working hours, I do not expect a response outside your own.

From: [David Jackson | IF](#)
To: clerk@colneyheathparishcouncil.gov.uk
Cc: [Brenda Taplin](#); [Paul Harding](#); [David Hodbod](#)
Subject: Re: [External] RE: [External] Conditions - Urgent please [GATELEY-GHAM.FID139926]
Date: 20 December 2024 14:18:11
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

How benevolent of them.
It's taken too long to address the other
more serious issues of
borehole location at Popefield.
This being linked with the reasonable
request that the applicant
pay for a survey so
we can establish scum
for condition.
Best
David Jackson
Sent from my iPhone

On 20 Dec 2024, at 13:48, clerk@colneyheathparishcouncil.gov.uk wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of IF Marketing Agency. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear David,

CHG have no objection to the amendment to Condition 75.

Kind Regards

Lisa

<!--[if !vml]--><!--[endif]-->

Lisa Peters LGCI PSLCC CPFA CiLCA

Clerk to the Council

For and on behalf of

Colney Heath Parish Council

Highfield Park Trust Visitor Centre

Hill End Lane

Hertfordshire AL4 0RA

Tel: 01727 825314

<!--[if !vml]--><!--[endif]-->Mobile: 07484 520070

Email: clerk@colneyheathparishcouncil.gov.uk

Website - www.colneyheathparishcouncil.gov.uk

<!--[if !vml]--><!--[endif]-->Parish Office opening hours are Thursday 9.30am-12.30pm



From: [David Jackson | IE](#)
To: [Brenda Taplin](#)
Cc: [Paul Harding](#); [David Hodbod](#)
Subject: Re: [External] URGENT - [External] Conditions - Urgent please [GATELEY-GHAM.FID139926]
Date: 20 December 2024 15:32:35

Thanks Brenda

We have tried to set out a logical rationale.

All of which is only needed because of possibility of gravel extraction completely terraforming the landscape 180 degrees of the listed site.

Best

David Jackson

Sent from my iPhone