

**Archived:** 09 August 2022 16:59:51

**From:** [Mary Petty](#)

**Sent:** Sat, 6 Aug 2022 11:50:13 +0000ARC

**To:** Wordsworth, Robert

**Subject:** Appeal Reference: APP/W1905/W/22/3300254

**Importance:** Normal

---

Dear Mr Wordsworth,

I wish to make the following additional comments to support upholding the Council's decision to refuse the planning application for 58 dwellings on the land directly behind Robinson Avenue and Cuffley Hill.

I have said previously that local services cannot meet the needs of the current population of Goffs Oak, let alone cope with the massive increase in population caused by the over-development of the area generally, and specifically by those who would live in the proposed 58 house (194 bedroom) development.

Please see attached extracts from a news bulletin sent on 23/06/22 to people currently registered at Valley View GP Practice in Goffs Oak – which is the GP Surgery nearest to the proposed development.

On 01/08/22 I rang the practice, at their request, to make a GP appointment. Please see attached my call record for that morning and note that those 119 calls were just to get to be put on hold on the automated phone queueing system, not to get through to the Receptionist.

As current residents of Goffs Oak, when we say that our services cannot take an influx of additional residents, we mean it. When we say over-populating the area leads to stress, reduced well-being, frustration and aggression, we mean it. All our services are at breaking point and could not support additional people and therefore the refusal to build should be upheld at appeal.

During the hearing/meeting on 25/01/22 one of the Councillors said that when the Council had been told how few houses Westminster required Broxbourne to build he was pleasantly surprised. Unfortunately, it is proving difficult to find what this figure is. Not the number proposed in the local plan (which was higher than the mystery required figure). The number of dwellings being built in Goffs Oak is huge and as it greatly exceeds the indicative numbers in the Local plan, which in turn exceeded the number required by Westminster, there is clearly no need to build on this particular site and the Council's sensible decision to refuse the development should stand.

At a meeting in 2019 a Councillor informed us with great certainty that this development was a 'done deal'. Three times a proposal for a development more than double the size of the indicative number has been put out for consultation. The 58 properties were refused by the Council's Planning Committee at a public meeting. (This is on a site which has previously had several proposed plans denied due to, among other factors the safety of the entrance onto Cuffley Hill). One might expect at that point that the greed of the developers might be dulled slightly and a smaller development might be proposed. But no, they appeal the decision, sticking to the dramatically inflated figures for their squashed and environmentally disastrous 58 houses.... Do they too know something we don't know?

This appeal should take the concerns that the people of Goffs Oak raised at consultation seriously. Carcinogenic contamination, obliteration of complex biodiverse habitats and dangerous access to the site to name but a few. Countryside properties should not use the planning system as a "second throw of the dice" to overturn the decision to refuse the proposed development, made appropriately and for good reasons under local policies to keep residents safe. The decision to refuse development on this site should be upheld.

Yours sincerely,  
Mary Petty

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows