

-----Original Message-----

From: Elaine Hartless [REDACTED]

Sent: 28 April 2025 10:23

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: OBJECTION to Application: s62a20250087

Dear Sir/Madam,

We urge you to dismiss application reference 5/2024/0144 for the following reasons.

The first reason for objection is based on historical precedent. The previous applications made in 2022 and 2024 were rejected at Appeal for several reasons. We see no justification to overturn these decisions, because all of the reasons continue to be valid.

Because the site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt, permission should only be given for the erection of new buildings or the use of existing buildings for agricultural or other essential purposes appropriate to a rural area, or small scale facilities for participatory sport or recreation. So the proposed use continues to fail to comply with 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. Therefore, this application still contravenes policy 143a (Watling Chase Community Forest) of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994. Again, there's no reason or justification to ignore this policy.

The part of Ragged Hall Lane where the land is located, is a narrow, single track road at national speed limit (60 mph) and is already dangerous for cars, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians alike.

Traffic ignores the 30 mph speed limit as it reaches the built up area, which is also a designated crossing point between the Public Footpath which starts at Cherry Hill, runs behind Hawthorn Way and then across Ragged Hall Lane.

The proposed development crosses a grass verge, between the developer's land and the road that is owned by the Council, according to Land Registry title plan HD504369. This begs the question is the developer claiming ownership of land to which he has no right? Therefore, how will the Developer be able to widen the road?

This also raises the issue of access to and from the site, on the two occasions that heavy plant has come in to clear the site. These vehicles have driven across a designated footpath. Does the developer have a private right to allow vehicles to be driven across this footpath?

Access to the site, however achieved, means that contractors vehicles will add to the danger already experienced by users of this area. Their vehicles will inevitably be parked up where ever they like, without consideration for the safety of those using the road, particularly walkers accessing the public footpath adjacent to the site. The noise and disruption they will cause will be exacerbated by general pollution.

Regarding the local environment, an ancient hedgerow has been destroyed and trees such as oak and beech that have naturally seeded have also been destroyed, as have the habitats for foxes, deer and other smaller wildlife. Barn owls are also regularly seen hunting in this area. The site forms part of an important wildlife corridor in the local area.

Other factors to take into consideration are:

The public footpath beside the site is well used and users would suffer a loss of visual amenity from the loss of openness of this site.

Despite a change in the parish boundaries, which now places the application site in St Stephen Parish, both St Michael and St Stephen Parish oppose the development of this site as it is not supported by either Neighbourhood Plan.

IF the council were to decide that special circumstances apply to allow development on this part of the green belt, then the size of the houses mean they would not be "affordable".

The proposed size means they will dominate the area and be out of keeping with the local area.

And of course permitting development of this site would cause a precedent for further development of other Green Belt sites within Chiswell Green, making future applications on the Green Belt more difficult to refuse.

The fact that each house will have parking for three cars, means that an additional 21 cars will be trying to access, what is already a dangerous single

track stretch of road due to the blind corner, which will be within yards of the access.

Yours faithfully Richard & Elaine Hartless

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Richard & Elaine Hartless.