

Archived: 09 August 2022 16:47:57

From: Barry Cressey

Sent: Mon, 8 Aug 2022 15:59:28 +0000Received: from LNX265CA0009.GBRP265.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:10a6:600:5e::21) by LO4P123MB4719.GBRP123.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:10a6:600:1cb::14) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.5504.14; Mon, 8 Aug 2022 15:59:27 +0000Received: from LO2GBR01FT031.eop

To: Wordsworth, Robert

Subject: Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/W/22/3300254

Importance: Normal

Dear Sir

Firstly my apologies for this late email regarding the above subject. I have made two unsuccessful attempts over the weekend to contact you before the deadline today's date.

As Secretary of the Goffs Oak Community Association, I have been closely involved with local concerned residents since the application by Countryside Properties UK Ltd. Ref: 07/19/0200/F last year.

When these residents received letters from Broxbourne Council Planning Officer and asked me what to write in response, I advised if they had concerns or objections regarding the application to erect 58 dwellings very close to their homes, they should state their concerns or objections to the Planning Officer named on the Council letter.

This was followed by a letter constructed by a resident living directly behind the proposed development reiterating in more detail the advice, copies were then hand delivered to all the local residents. This resulted in 126 letters and emails being sent to the Planning Officer.

I together with the above resident attended the Planning and Regulatory Committee meeting on the 25th January 2022. The resident Adrian Petty was permitted to speak at this meeting on behalf of the local residents putting the reasons why this application should in opinion of the local residents, be refused. The decision of the Planning Committee was to reject the application.

Following your reply and clarification to Mr Petty, a meeting of myself and three local residents, including Mr Petty. I advised caution in respect of applying for Rule 6 status, as we could be held responsible for the Appellant's costs. The decision was not to apply for Rule 6 status, but to attend the Inquiry as interested and concerned residents.

My apologies again if you are already aware of the lead up to this appeal.

Regarding the forthcoming appeal, there are two major objections that the Planning Committee took into account when the application was rejected.

(1) The number of dwellings proposed by Countryside Properties in their application 58 dwellings, compared to the number in the Broxbourne Local Plan of 26 for this site.

Our speaker Mr Petty was asked at the Planning Committee meeting by the Planning Committee Chairman, if the number of dwellings were to be reduced, would a reduction be acceptable.

Mr Petty replied, he could not answer the

question on behalf of the local residents,
without consulting them.

(2) The application did not meet the required standard of Biodiversity.

The land named in the application is
stated as a derelict nursery site.

In fact the land had previously been known
as 2 distinct old nursery sites Rosemead
Nursery and Fairmead Nursery.

Rosemead Nursery had an application for
development rejected by the Borough Council in 1990, an appeal was made to
the Planning Inspectorate and dismissed
by the Inspector 26th April 1991.

We have copies of the Planning Inspectorate letter confirming dismissal.
The site put forward for development is
stated in the Inspectors letter, as showing
no eviof previous nursery use, and is overgrown with numerous established
trees, which visually forms part of the
large woodland behind the site.

We have recorded evidence that this site
ii an established habitat for wildlife and
protected species of bats and birds nesting in these trees.

The site is landlocked on three sides by
existing houses and the woodland behind
and can only be entered from one narrow
gap between existing houses from the
main road, and currently is undisturbed.

Should the Appeal Inquiry agree that the
site is suitable for development for homes,
the protected species habitat would be
disturbed and probably destroyed, which
I understand would be illegal.

Yours sincerely

Barry Cressey (Secretary)
Goffs Oak Community Association