

**Standing up for Hertfordshire's countryside**

Peter Quaile  
Planning and Development  
Broxbourne Borough Council  
Bishop's College  
Churchgate  
Cheshunt  
EN8 9XQ

Our Ref:

Your Ref:

24<sup>th</sup> April 2019 (by email)

Dear Mr. Quaile,

**Application No. 07/19/0200/F**  
**Erection of 58 dwellings (17 No. 2 bed, 14 No. 3 Bed, 22 No. 4 bed, 1 No. 5 bed) with**  
**associated infrastructure**  
**At Fairmead, 90 Cuffley Hill, Goffs Oak, Hertfordshire EN7 5EX**

As with other recent applications for redevelopment of former nursery sites, the applicant bases the justification for this proposed development on the Submission Local Plan 2018-2033. The Examination in Public of the Submission Local Plan has not concluded and the Plan is not yet adopted. Under both the current Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development within the Green Belt should have been presented by the applicant, but are omitted from the application. The proposed removal of this site from the Green Belt was objected to at the Examination In Public and to approve development in advance of the Inspector's adjudication would be inappropriate.

Notwithstanding the merits of the inclusion of the site in the Submission Local Plan, this proposal represents an increase in the number of dwellings of over 120% on the indicative numbers in Policy GO5 in the Submission Local Plan. This is overdevelopment of a backland site, much of which contains mature trees subject to TPOs.

We have significant concerns regarding the access arrangements to the site. In the Design and Access Statement it is stated that the site is accessed via a lay-by off the B156 (para. 3.1) This is not the case: houses nos. 90 - 98 Cuffley Hill are serviced by an access road separated from the B156 by a wide verge containing 7 mature trees. This would be breached by the proposed main spine road of the new development, resulting in three junctions in very close proximity to each other. There is potential for conflict for both vehicles and pedestrians. This situation would be exacerbated should the proposed development of the adjacent C.G. Edwards site proceed, which would introduce a fourth entrance within a 100m. stretch of this busy road.

For the above reasons we urge the Council to reject this application.

Yours sincerely,

David Irving