

Holly Butrimas-Gair

From: Liz Fitzgerald
Sent: 11 August 2022 15:00
To: Holly Butrimas-Gair
Subject: FW: APP/W1905/W/22/3300254 Objection

Kind Regards

Liz Fitzgerald

Director



33 Bancroft, Hitchin, Herts SG5 1LA

T: 01462 420224

M: 07732 046062

W: www.barkerparry.co.uk

This email and any attachments are confidential and may also be privileged. They are intended solely for the named addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient you must not read, copy, distribute or disseminate the information. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately and delete it. [Click here](#) for full privacy policy.

From: Wordsworth, Robert <ROBERT.WORDSWORTH@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 August 2022 14:57
To: Liz Fitzgerald <liz@barkerparry.co.uk>; Jennifer Thompson <jennifer.thompson@broxbourne.gov.uk>
Cc: diane.parsley@broxbourne.gov.uk
Subject: FW: APP/W1905/W/22/3300254 Objection

Dear both

Please see correspondence below from an interested party for your information.

Kind regards

Robert Wordsworth



The Planning Inspectorate

Major Casework, Room 3/J, Temple Quay House, 2 the Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN
Tel: 0303 4445608 (Voicemail only) Possible post delays due to Covid-19
Email: robert.wordsworth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk (NOTE NEW EMAIL)
**(please note that I'm working from home, email is the best way to contact me.
A direct phone call may not be answered but please leave a message)**
Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)
<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate>

From: Richard Taylor
Sent: 10 August 2022 16:55
To: Wordsworth, Robert <ROBERT.WORDSWORTH@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: APP/W1905/W/22/3300254 Objection

Dear Sir

Due to my wife's ill health I have had little time to address this Appeal and hope my simple representation is of value.

Policy GO5.

a) It is stated in the Local Plan June 2020, which I assume you should be bound by, that an area North of Cuffley Hill should be allocated for residential development in Policy GO5. I cannot remember if the land has been taken out of the Green Belt by the Plan but I will be certain by my birthday on 27 September!

b) It is suggested the sites will be developed independently.

c) Housing numbers have been allocated to a number of sites in Goffs Oak and immediately adjacent land in Cheshunt where about 1,000 dwellings have been allocated or one seventh approximately of the whole housing allocation for the whole Borough.

d) Due to the tightness of the Green Belt around existing settlements the number of dwellings is paramount locally in terms of services and traffic.

e) The three sites have

i) approximately 20 dwellings on CG Edwards site that has been developed already. Actually 21 houses were constructed with NO affordable housing. The circa number in that case was 21 with no affordable house. The requirement for all three sites is for 40% affordable housing.

ii) The other two sites have a housing allocation with circa 14 houses on Rosemead and circa 12 on Fairmead. This is a total of 26 houses. These are the two remaining undeveloped sites.

iii) The proposal before you is to build 58 houses, not 26, on the two combined sites with again no affordable housing and no justification to intensify the number of dwellings on the development, unsurprisingly.

f) The planning officer responsible for this site was said to have agreed to this vast increase in the number of houses in Pre App discussions. I strongly object for if this overprovision is repeated on other housing sites throughout the Plan there will be a significant overprovision. Equally why bother having a Plan at all?

g) It is suggested in the detail of the appeal before you that the two undeveloped sites should not provide 26 houses but 58. Repeat **fifty eight** and again no affordable housing whatsoever for young people trying to get on the property ladder and probably related to other Goffs Oak residents in any case.

h) 28 new dwellings for the two sites might sit within the definition of "circa" as shown in the Edwards scheme. The concept of 58 is quite disproportionate to the whole Plan and I hope you will reject it out of hand. If it had said 52 or 54 in the 2020 Plan, I could not have objected. However it didn't and it said 26 dwellings.

I have been involved in a number of appeals where evidence was taken even after the examination was held. Please accept this simple brief representation that highlights matters that I think are crucial to determining the outcome of this Appeal, even if it is a couple of days late and which are simplicity itself.

Please reject this Appeal to give certainty to residents that they should honour the Plan and keep within its rules, unlike this Appeal.

Yours faithfully

Richard Taylor BSc FRICS

[Please take a moment to review the Planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice which can be accessed by clicking this link.](#)

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments,

you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



Please consider the environment before printing this email