

From: financially [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 April 2025 12:14
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major
<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Appeal against: Application for Building Approval in Ragged Hall Lane

Mr Bren, Everett, Calver,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

27th April 2025.

Reference: **Appeal Against, Building Approval in Ragged Hall Lane, St Albans. Herts.**

Dear Sir or Madam,

I have just received notification of a planning submission for approval by property developer Martin Holderness for **7 self-build dwelling in Ragged Hall Lane**, opposite Cuckman's Farm St Albans, Herts. This will be the third I believe application I have appealed against which have not met planning criteria therefore, seems to be a campaign of harassment against the local community who, have been asked to consider the merit of building 7 homes before, none of which, have met the governments criteria for much needed affordable homes, not withstanding the environmental needs of this community, that is surrounded by three motorways to earn the dubious reputation of being called the "Golden Triangle". In the view of Chiswell Green residents this matter impacts our live most as this area of Green Belt is the only descent piece of environment we have left that, offers access to a barrier from noise and pollution, so necessary for quality of Life and mental health.

Unfortunately, with each year this gets encroached upon with a Planning Policy of two houses being built where one existed, all of which adds to extra vehicles per household that access onto the Watford Road from local, and outlying housing estates in other districts north, all needing employment South of the M25 which, itself has overloaded arterial routes between the said M1, M25, A414 Motorway

forming the "Golden Triangle. The situation residents now suffer is road congestion since the M25 was built, that upon maintenance closure also means large volumes of traffic "rats run" through, which, any additional homes will only exacerbate, especially in "Rush Hour", where trying to access the Watford Road becomes extremely difficult when selfish drivers never give way or traffic lights cause chaos, that prevent the elderly who need to get to shops and health appointments. I also ask for consideration to the effect destruction of "Green Belt" this development will have on the ecology where already surveys show rapid population decline of Birds and insects caused by the destruction of habitat has upon Flora, Fauna, and Agriculture we also share Green Belt with. I also need to point out that added homes places even more demand on existing main sewerage that was never intended to meet demand 150 years on and often collapses causing major traffic disruption on the Watford Road.

My understanding of the government recent policy is the need for "Affordable Housing", the government accuses our Council of not apparently providing. I can categorically dispute this claim, being the victim of building approval against every safety regulation in terms of Air Gap proximity, and excavation too close to the foundations of my home, where foundations were dug too deep to bury excessive roof line height, effecting the water table in order to construct two homes where one bungalow once comfortably sat, shows determination to build not the opposite. I can also point to past corruption charges of collusion with developers causing resignation after years of successful awards of development land by Head Planner Peter Learner which refutes government claims. However, I digress because in terms demand now for "affordable Housing", which I fully appreciate, this application comes nowhere near addressing.

However, in my estimation of this developer, he has never been in business to offer affordable homes, and now has changed tact from previous rejected applications, to seek advantage of a loophole the government has presented him, to cause him to resubmit his previous planning refusals. His latest ploy seems to be "Self-Build Homes" on the pretext this will offer affordable homes. The contradiction is, by the time one takes into account the cost of land in this district, (the most expensive in the country), and inflated price of raw materials in the present economic crisis, and Labour costs for even non skilled builders with consequent added building time due non skills, these houses won't be anywhere near affordable to meet demands or justify destroying Green Belt. (See link below)

In view of my three main points I request consideration to my objection to planning consent be upheld, and acceptance of my contention there must be more suitable areas to build elsewhere in the country, where costs of Land, Rates

and services really are affordable, and employment opportunities exist OR are (planned cohesively) in with housing development, not built as an after -thought.

I remain,

Yours Faithfully,

Mr Bren Calver.