

OBJECTION TO APPLICATION REFERENCE S6/2015/1342/PP

General

I am totally opposed in principle to any developments on Green Belt Land. In my opinion all Brownfield sites should be developed before any Green Belt sites are destroyed forever. Furthermore this would give the opportunity to revisit the estimates for housing requirements over many years, which would probably result in less being required than is currently being proposed.

Applicant's case for "Very Special Circumstances"

I have studied this case in great detail and found many flaws. My comments follow in chronological order with links to the relevant paragraphs.

1.6 – contains unsupported/inflated claims including creation of real opportunities for local primary school children to walk to school, ability to reduce reliance on the car and (amazingly) a reduction in traffic congestion. The number of children who would realistically be able to walk to school would be very few indeed, those who need to use cars because they are located further away would continue to need to use them, and adding over 100 dwellings is far more likely to increase traffic congestion than to reduce it.

2.1 – they are so out of touch with the locality that they think Cuffley has "pharmacies". There has been only one for over 50 years.

2.5 – they quote 15% reduction in population over 24 years. They no doubt chose 24 years because it gave the "right" percentage. The fact that people are living longer is a major contributory factor.

2.6 – how ridiculous to compare the growth in house prices with "the rest of England". Cuffley is a desirable village in a commuter area close to London.

3.2 and 3.4 – unfortunately the emerging Local Plan is fundamentally flawed. It contains much higher figures for future development than necessary due to the fact that certain once only events took place which spiked the increases in recent years.

4.4 and table – they have selected two periods with low percentages, and compared those with a longer period with the percentage which is close to the target. This actually proves that in the earlier years the percentages were significantly higher than the target. I am not sure that these figures support their case.

4.10 – as with paragraph 2.6 it is ridiculous to compare Cuffley with other places.

5.7 – contains another unsupported assertion that only they can provide a "unique set of opportunities". Their engagement with the local community includes **reducing** the number of bungalows planned, in response to a request to **increase** that number!

5.13 – repeats the assertion that only their site can provide “a unique package of benefits”. They have failed to mention that their unspecified level of local support is opposed by many villagers.

7.4 – they mention there is an issue with dog walkers. Why mention this at all? They are not proposing any solution.

8, 10 – starts with the provision of a footpath and cycleway. However, the letter from the Parish Council at Appendix 5 includes that agreement has been reached to install offset obstructions **to prevent through cycling!**

8.11 – I have not checked the sources of their statistics – or their maths – but the whole paragraph is based on assumptions which may or may not be correct. In any event, 16 children out of a total school roll of (my estimate) 350 is roughly 4%. This is hardly significant.

8.13 – based on the preceding paragraphs, there **could** be 16 or less cars dropping off their children at the school. There will be no effect whatsoever on the children who live in other parts of Cuffley or further away. Hardly significant.

9.4 – whilst the suggested widening of the entrance to KGV playing field would be welcomed, the argument that follows is complete rubbish. The 30 mph sign is reached **before** the entrance. In any event drivers are by law required to slow down from the National Speed Limit to the indicated speed **before** they reach the sign.