

Dear Sirs.

Re 6/2023/2418/OUTLINE Former Hook Lane Kennels.

I write to strongly object to the above outline application.

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent uncontrolled spread of urban areas by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness and its permanence.

The Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 87) sets out that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in **Very Special Circumstances**. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt is harmful in principle, even if it is not visible from a public viewpoint.

No such circumstances have been put forward and the development is completely visible from my property and that of my neighbours with up to 3 storey apartments proposed in several of the blocks directly in my line of sight.

Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

(my comments in red)

- *buildings for agriculture and forestry; NO*
- *provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; NO*
- *the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; NO*
- *the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; NO*
- *limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; NO*
- *limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development; NO*

The proposals do not therefore comply with any of the appropriate developments in the NPPF

And no ***Very Special Circumstances*** exist or have been put forward to justify this.

Additional comments:

The roadway serving my home in Firs Wood Close, maintained at the expense of Northaw Park Management Limited to which I make personal contribution, cannot withstand further traffic/weight. It is cracking with our endeavours to maintain it and will not sustain further traffic. It will definitely not sustain building vehicles and any increase of traffic.

These plans show no understanding of what it is to live in an area such as this. To propose housing for the elderly/infirm in a road where the sole access to it is Coopers Lane Road - with no pavements - is dangerous. Housing for vulnerable/elderly people should not be sited in a remote place (which becomes inaccessible in snowy conditions) - to encourage this in this area is irresponsible and dangerous.

The sewage treatment plant serving Firs Wood Close, to which I contribute, is sited amidst this proposal with no explanation of how I will be affected.

Drainage – what are the drainage implications of this development - will the water table be disturbed?

Utility supplies – how would I be affected?

Refuse collection – unfortunately no recycling facilities are available to Firs Wood Close. Why would a further development be sited where this provision is not made?

It is unclear from the plans I have examined how Firs Wood Close car parking capacity would be maintained?

Firs Wood Close residents pay towards the upkeep of roadways, car parks, tennis courts and extensive grounds in this area and have done so for many years.

This site is not of sufficient size to accommodate this number of dwellings - it forms over- development.

This area has no pavements and no public transport so car ownership is required. My understanding is that potential new build should not be dependent on car ownership as this is not environmentally friendly. The applicant has argued that car ownership is not high in this older age category but we know this is not the case.

The development, in this location, is non-sustainable with no public transport links to local amenities and is therefore contrary to National and Local Planning Policies.

In summary, [REDACTED] to achieve remoteness of living having previously lived in a built-up area. I will do all I can to preserve this wonderful natural environment. England is beautiful because of its green belt laws and village living and I cannot stand by and watch destruction of nature and overdevelopment on this plot. But fundamentally, I cannot stand by and watch housing for the elderly be introduced in a completely unrealistic location which does not suit need and has inherent dangers.

I trust that the application will be refused under delegated powers in order to protect the Green Belt.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]