

[REDACTED]

Sent: 12 September 2021 19:14
To: Planning Mailbox
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 07/19/0200/F dated 23rd August 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

This will be at least the fourth letter I have written in Objection to the proposed Fairmead Development.

In turn it is the third application sent out during a holiday period, I do not consider this to be fair or reasonable to the residents who will be mostly affected, the nett result being less letters of objection within the 21-day given period.

May I respectfully remind you of The Indicative Plan for GO5 endorsed by the Government's Independent Inspector William Fieldhouse - C G Edwards 20, Rosemead 14, Fairmead 12, a Total of 46 dwellings.

I am at a loss to understand how you can now entertain a potential total figure of 81 units. Edwards was increased to 23 currently still under construction. Rosemead which incidentally never had greenhouses on it joined forces with Fairmead the development in this proposal. One could therefore argue given the Inspectors Report that Fairmead should not exceed 23 dwellings. However, if we revert back to 26 units

14 & 12 respectively making 26 dwellings. The proposed figure in the revised plan is still 58 dwellings an increase of 32 units, equating to an uplift in excess of 123%. These grossly inflated figures are not in keeping with the words circa, approximately or indicative neither are they in accordance with the council's own plan. It would have been interesting to see the response from the Inspector had these figures been submitted to him.

This over density housing estate proposal to be built on Green Belt Land not in keeping with the surrounding properties is the main bone of contention. I am equally at a loss to understand given that this is the third application why Countryside Properties persist with such a congested housing estate. I get the distinct impression that the residents are not the only party who feel this is a deliberate over density development taken to the extreme.

Further calculations reveal the whole Fairmead site as being 7.66 acres including trees green areas and attenuation. This leaves the area for development being 5.83 acres. The total development area of 2.36 hectares includes the access roads to the dwellings, over congested at 10 dwellings per acre.

In terms of Biodiversity which is currently particularly topical given climate change / global warming and pollution the existing land is in keeping with what's left of our rural village. There are numerous types of established trees many of which carry

TPO's (illegally breached already prior to planning consent) along with a hedgerow containing various blossoming trees at the end of gardens 1-55 Robinson Avenue these bloom at differing times over the entire spring each year producing a magnificent display. This hedgerow is not in need of being replaced as per the plans, I would suggest some maintenance from a knowledgeable tree surgery company is all that would be required. All these trees and hedgerows are particularly beneficial in the control of pollution levels.

This area also is a haven to a multitude of wildlife mammals' birds and reptiles too numerous to list. Due to over development in other places many species are becoming rarer and as a result are also protected.

In the unfortunate event of a development of this magnitude being given the green light the latest proposal would decimate all flora and fauna never to return turning it into an ever-increasing urban sprawl. There is a miss conception within the design statement that this can magically be recreated, in short it cannot consult the CPRE for their take on it.

The B156 is noticeably becoming much heavier with all manner of traffic and not only during peak hours but in down times too. This proposed development along with St Edwards Gate will only exacerbate this problem. There will be simply be too many turnings in close proximity to one another 23 dwellings from St Edwards Gate along with a potential 58 dwellings from Fairmead from 1-5 bed houses converging on to a road that was simply not designed for such expansion along with our existing roads is not sustainable.

It is a dangerous recipe for inevitable accidents causing injuries and or deaths. It should of course be taken into consideration that most families have more than one car, the calculation for the extra number of vehicles is dependent on age and number the number of bedrooms per dwelling.

Whilst on the subject of infrastructure four areas immediately spring to mind as major concerns. What provisions are being made to increase the size or number of surgeries along with health professionals in order to accommodate a growth population approaching double? The same question arises with education facilities currently vastly oversubscribed? Parking is already a major issue; it is unreasonable to suggest we either walk or cycle particularly for our aged ill or infirm residents as has been suggested in the past by certain councillors? What are your intentions to combat pollution from extra traffic, whether you like it or not this has to allow for the extra traffic in the event of a problem on the M25 between junctions 24 & 25 coming through Goffs Oak's B156, which is a regular occurrence?

If this high-density housing estate which I strongly object to was to go ahead the inconvenience to existing residents would be intolerable over a number of years. The continual noise dust, pollution of many kinds would in no way be conducive to the health and wellbeing for any of us neither would it be in keeping with rural density or the character of Goffs Oak Village.

In conclusion I would ask all of the planning committee to look at not just present objections, but past letters on the portal as well, and reject this proposed development on the Fairmead site in Goffs Oak.

Yours sincerely,

Nick Turnbull

21 Robinson Avenue
Goffs Oak

Kind Regards

Nick Turnbull

