

From: jeff Bates [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 April 2025 12:33
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Ref S62A/2025/0087

I wish to object to the proposed plans for the land between 84 and 102 Ragged Hall Lane, on the following grounds.

The first ground for objection is based on historical precedent. The previous applications made in 2022 and 2024 were rejected at Appeal for multiple reasons (Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/W/23/3320280 & Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/W/24/3345004). All of the reasons for rejection remain valid today.

The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt where the proposed use is, as before, unacceptable in terms of the provisions of PPG2 (Green Belt) and Policies 1 (Metropolitan Green Belt) and 2 (Settlement strategy) of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

The site is located within, and designated as part of, the Watling Chase Community Forest and so this application still contravenes policy 143a (Watling Chase Community Forest) of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994.

The number of 'self-build' homes proposed is no different to the previous application and looks very much as though attempting "planning by piecemeal". As soon as one part is granted, the application will change to grab a second bite (and so on) until the original application is complete. The time-frame of disruption and risk to the local community simply becomes longer.

The part of Ragged Hall Lane where the land sits, is a narrow, single track road at national speed limit (60MPH) and is already dangerous for cars, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians alike. Having read the Transport Assessment document (Published May 2022), I would argue that the ATC measuring device was placed at the narrowest point between two passing places creating a natural speed restriction. Had the ATC been placed at the point of the 30 MPH signs, they would have evidenced speeds in excess of 30MPH as the majority of eastbound traffic accelerates in preparation for where the road widens.

With an average of 3 cars per property (based on original application for homes with 6 bedrooms) and close to what is already a blind corner leading from Hawthorn Way and a designated footpath crossing point, this proposed development represents a significant increase in traffic at this pinch point and subsequently an increased risk to the local community.

Furthermore, with the site's location any development will create a significant disruption to the local population with both noise and general pollution. Notwithstanding the volume of traffic that would be generated in order to bring materials to and remove waste from, the site.

Contractors historically park their vehicles anywhere they can, regardless of the safety or considerations of other road users.

Please also note that there is no pavement along any stretch of the single track lane, which is very popular with walkers, horses, and cyclists. There is no safe access to the designated footpaths which adjoin the proposed development, without walking down the carriageway. As a daily user of these footpaths, it can be difficult even now.

Finally; the local ecology has already been impacted by the two hurried clearances of the site, with the loss of an ancient hedgerow plus many established, naturally seeded, oaks and beech trees, which provided habitats for Foxes, Deer, Birds and various small wildlife. Within a designated greenbelt site, this is unacceptable.

I would like to add an additional note: Having compared the developer's site plan to the Land Registry title plan HD504369, I am concerned that the developer appears to be claiming land that they may have no right to. The developer's proposal includes land directly adjacent to the road, however HD504369 indicates that there is a council owned verge, between the road and the proposed development. I therefore believe that this planning application should be rejected (along with other reasons already given) until the true land ownership and rights of access, are established. Finally, if my assumptions are correct, it would imply that there is no current vehicular access to this site. In which case, questions how the two land clearances were facilitated

Regards Jeff Bates