

G. Snoad



Object to Proposal

Planning Reference 5/2025/0331

Sirs,

I am very surprised that the above planning application containing details that have already been twice been submitted, rejected, appealed and again rejected by the St. Albans District Council and the Planning Inspectorate in the past, has been reintroduced. This unamended submission appears to rely on the applicants interpretation of the politically recently introduced classification of "Grey Belt" into Green Belt planning considerations.

Whilst one can understand the need for affordable housing, it is important to recognise that the reduction of Green Belt and the precedents set thereby will reduce the reduce the individual identity and character of Chiswell Green within the overall area development. The retention of Green areas are important to residents and make the area a pleasant place to live, reduce pollution and combat climate change. The proposed development area is extensively used by dog and leisure walkers, as well as more active people in the locality.

I also believe that access to the proposed properties will cause additional disruption to existing residents and road users as vehicle ownership is likely to be two or more vehicles per property.

As previously mentioned the need for additional housing is needed but in the Chiswell Green area builders have been erecting rebuilding overlarge properties that have been priced well out of the pockets of most people and I do not see that this development of seven houses, self build or not, will improve the situation. In fact this development is more likely to be promoted as an exclusive "club" to be bought or invested by people outside of the area and will not improve any housing shortage in St. Albans or the immediate area.

Although the definition of the land has been re-interpreted, the land itself and its situation in the area has not changed and I believe the opinions of the SADC and Planning Inspectorate concerning the original rejections of the previous planning applications are still valid and should be taken into consideration in this present application.

Yours Faithfully,
G. Snoad