

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Ref. Rep No. Applicant
0571 5 The Breachwood Green Society

Agent

Document Section: King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Representation: *Object*

The Society deplores the fact that all 3 proposed sites in this settlement are a) within the Green Belt b) graded agricultural land, and c) outside the Draft Settlement Boundary proposed and agreed in 2007.

This village is not an appropriate settlement for additional residential development, for the following reasons:

1. Compared with other villages in the vicinity Breachwood Green already has a higher proportion of terraced and ex council properties in the lower price range.
2. The village has no shop, no doctors surgery, a very part-time Post Office and an infrequent 6 day a week bus service, bus station. These circumstances result in multiple car journeys for residents on narrow country lanes.
3. The Village Primary School is always oversubscribed with no space for expansion (the school field and adjoining land was taken by the council in the 1960s to build council houses).
4. That area of the village in which 49 and 50 are situated is subject to high noise levels from the flight path of Luton Airport.

Breachwood Green cannot sustain further residential development that would bring no positives to the economy or the environment, would worsen traffic problems and alter the rural character of the village.

1753 6 Williamson

Document Section: King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Representation: *Comment*

I have studied the proposed site 49, 50 and 51 for future development and have the following comments to make; bearing in mind all three sites are outside the proposed village boundary.

Please let common sense prevail and keep Breachwood Green bearing in mind, if any of the proposed development for East of Luton goes ahead there would be sufficient housing in the area without spoiling a small green oasis in our much loved village.

4963 4 Greet

Document Section: King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Representation: *Object*

The settlement of Breachwood Green is an inappropriate place for additional residential development: We have no shopping or medical facilities here. The Post Office operates for only a few hours a week and the bus service is minimal. The School is permanently oversubscribed. For these reasons many extra car journeys would be an inevitable product of more houses. Sites 49 & 50 are under the Luton Airport flightpath and subject to high noise levels. All 3 sites are in the green belt and outside the Draft Settlement Boundary agreed in 2007; this boundary recognises that this is a rural area and should not be turned into suburbia. The proposal that allotments should be built on it perverse at a time when there is a national drive to create more allotments and encourage more people to grow their own food and at the same time get healthy exercise. The latter is ideal in rural areas, where carbon emitting journey would be required to reach a gym.

6344 1 Carr

Document Section: King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Representation: *Object*

Firstly may I express my displeasure at the way this affair has been conducted, why were only selected individuals informed of that proposals were being invited, as residents of

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Breachwood Green surely, every resident should have been informed. I only got to hear about the proposals through the grape vine.

All three proposals would have a grossly detrimental impact on our village, & the only reason they have been proposed is for profit of the land owners or their close friends. □ Kings Walden Estate own both lots of allotments & would make millions of pounds if the land was sold as residential.

With regard to the Paddock off Lower road. Who the Hell does Roger Wood think he is? To my knowledge he is just a resident of Breachwood Green, & has no more right or qualification to make these proposals, than myself or any other resident. Except for the fact that he is good friends (& I believe members of the same book club) as the owner of the land in question & also the owner of the large rear garden which is conveniently adjacent to the proposed land, & would therefore suddenly become very viable as land to be developed.

Hardly an impartial point of view from Mr Wood!

The two allotment areas, if developed would simply not fit in with the village character & would turn the village into something similar to high density town life, currently there is not enough parking for the properties nearby that do not benefit from having their own off street parking, irrespective of whether any new properties would have adequate parking (at least two places per dwelling) the result on the existing cottages would mean cars would have to park on both sides of the main road probably on the footpath, which not only is unsafe for motorists, it would make it perilous for pedestrians, in particular children walking to school.

The Paddock on lower road currently provides recreation for a good number of local dog owners complimenting the rural lifestyle that the village currently has. I am aware this will have little significance to any planning decision, but it is still worth mentioning.

As well as this. several of the cottages park their cars within the paddock to prevent lower road being totally blocked, if developed this would cause mayhem.

Although I must admit that a single large house or possibly two (max) wouldn't be that unacceptable on this plot, but everyone knows full well that greed will take over & as many homes as possible will be sited if allowed.

I am not adverse to a few houses being added to the village as long as they are in-keeping with the rest of the village, but high density housing on the proposed sites, would turn this rural green belt Hertfordshire village, into yet another suburb of Luton, as has happened to some villages closer to Luton already.

Please don't let the greed of a few spoil our village?

6347 4 Bowles

Document Section: King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Representation: *Object*

I am protesting most strongly against the outline planning proposals for the expansion of residential building within Breachwood Green that will impinge most detrimentally on the village.

I am objecting on the following grounds:

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Community sensitivity

Scarce amenity

Protection of the Environment

Background

Breachwood Green is a small village approached by four steep roads which are, in places, single track with blind bends. The village is essentially located around four roads; the Heath of which Heath Road and Chapel road are extensions, Oxford Road, Lower Road and Coleman's Road, which leads into Browning's Lane. Considerable residential infilling was carried out in the '60s and '70s and at the same time the creation of St Mary's Rise and Orchard Way.

6391 1 Davies

Document Section: King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Representation: *Object*

I am protesting most strongly against the outline planning proposals for the expansion of residential building within Breachwood Green that will impinge most detrimentally on the village.

I am objecting on the following grounds:

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Road congestion within the village

Community sensitivity

Scarce amenity

Protection of the Environment

Background

Breachwood Green is a small village approached by four steep roads which are, in places, single track with blind bends. The village is essentially located around four roads; the Heath of which Heath Road and Chapel road are extensions, Oxford Road, Lower Road and Coleman's Road, which leads into Browning's Lane. Considerable residential infilling was carried out in the '60s and '70s and at the same time the creation of St Mary's Rise and Orchard Way.

Community sensitivity

Whilst lip service may be given to the provision of affordable housing for local people, experience shows that unless rented by the local authority or sold leasehold with caveats that only local people can be housed, such housing will inevitably be sold on at market prices. Moreover as far as I am aware there has never been a definition of who qualifies as local and if there is not enough local uptake then clearly the housing will be made available to incomers and the whole justification for building such houses will be betrayed.

The local village community is made up of those whose roots lie in rural communities and those who are in voluntary exile from the urban and suburban rat race. There appears to be no concern over our community's sensitivity to the rural landscape and enjoyment of our homes as required by the Human Rights Act (Articles 8 and 14). In a multicultural democracy equal weight should be given to the needs of rural culture and the sensitivities of the rural community as to any other community.

Over the last 20 years we have seen and resisted a growing pincer movement against our community. There is the current proposed East of Luton expansion, the West of Stevenage expansion, which was successfully opposed only to be imposed by the then MP for Hull East and Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, and the proposed huge expansion of Luton Airport which would have completely destroyed acres of farmland and access from my village to the south.

We now find that there is another proposed expansion from Luton Airport for commercial premises over existing farmland almost to the borders of my home village and finally proposals to squeeze more building into our village. This country is of finite size and cannot continue to support the concreting over of productive and soak land. Moreover we are continually told that we have either reached or will soon reach peak oil. If that is the case, shipment by road, air and sea will become prohibitively expensive and we will have to rely far more, or even exclusively, on locally grown produce. How will that be achieved if our productive land has been swallowed up?

More and more children have no concept of where their food is grown or raised; indeed if it does not come out of a plastic wrapper they are liable to refuse to eat it. A report on the radio only recently indicated that when children were encouraged to grow their own food they were far more amenable to 'eating their greens'. Further building over productive land will distance more and more of our children from appreciating where food comes from and the vital necessity of keeping productive land free of urban development.

Scarce amenity

Allotments are becoming a scarce amenity. The UK's first food security assessment was launched this year by the Government's Department of Food and rural affairs (DEFRA) as part of a package of material on the future of our food system. The material discusses issues ranging from how we can create a sustainable food system locally and globally. It is thus hypocritical to demand that more and more land capable of feeding us is destroyed.

Ironically National Allotment Week took place during this consultation period. This was a week to promote the awareness and availability of allotments both locally and nationally and to show the public and the local authorities the strength of support and interest for the heritage of allotment culture. It was also to promote the social benefits of allotment gardening, which include benefits to health, education and community well-being.

Protection of the Environment

Villages, such as Breachwood Green, and the landscape in which they are situated are unique to the English countryside. Destruction of these landscapes is a desecration of the heritage, character and tradition of England. Just as we accept that buildings of unique historical and architectural beauty and interest should be preserved and conserved so also must the historical landscapes of our country be treated.

The relentless destruction of our natural environment with the creation and spread of settlements caused by an unnatural increase in population pressure, encouraged by politicians, leads to the depletion of our natural resources. As a result our productive land is invaded and degraded. It should be noted that not only is England the most densely populated country in Europe but also as densely populated as Bangladesh.

Moreover, the natural aspiration of people to own cars will increase carbon emissions. Tragically the proposed development will contribute to the destruction of the natural environment,

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



King's Walden (includes Breachwood Green)

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

which acts as an organic sink for carbon through the photosynthesis carried out by green plant chlorophyll.

It must never be forgotten that building such as is proposed can and will never be reversed. When the land is gone it is gone for ever.

It is also blindingly obvious that run-off from the hard surfaces created by building not only causes flooding, by rainwater flowing into river systems that cannot cope with it, but also, thereby, reduces the transport of water through the natural soil, rock and subsurface to replenish natural aquifers. Thus development not only increases flooding but reduces the water table and available ground water. Only in December 2008 the Environment Agency published a report which stated that East Anglia is already considered to be an area of great water stress and that many lakes, estuaries and rivers are drained so quickly that there is a danger to wildlife and that there is already less water available per head in this part of England than those living in Egypt and Morocco. The report says the pressure is greatest in the South East and Eastern England, the driest and most crowded parts of England and Wales.

Summary

If planning permission is given for these sites in Breachwood Green then not only will the already unacceptable congestion in the village become insupportable but also such additional housing will contribute to an increase in local pollution by creating rubbish and sewerage, and through the natural aspiration of people to own cars, increased carbon emissions. Building over agricultural and natural land will also destroy wildlife habitats.

We have a moral and spiritual duty to protect and preserve our natural heritage and to leave a light footprint for future generations who must live in this land. Our natural heritage is also our cultural heritage. Clearly the permanent destruction of food land and soak land will have an ongoing detrimental effect on those who live here both now and in the future.

In addition England's unique countryside with its villages is also a world renowned tourist attraction. I have had visitors who were in awe of the beauty and peacefulness of our local countryside.

It is noteworthy that those who have proposed these sites do not themselves stand to be adversely affected in the enjoyment of their homes.

"Never give in, never give in, never, never, never, never, in nothing, great or small, large or petty, never give in except to convictions of honour and good sense. Never yield to force; never yield to the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy."

Churchill, Harrow School, 29 October 1941.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent
0459 99 CPRE - The Hertfordshire Society

Document Section: Site 49
Representation: *Object*

This site is in the Green Belt and is outside the identified village boundary for Breachwood Green proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (September 2007). No justification for its release for development has been provided.

0571 6 The Breachwood Green Society

Document Section: Site 49
Representation: *Object*

This site is subject to levels of aircraft noise exceeding 82dB - a noise category that precludes development. The noise disturbance can only worsen here: larger, noisier planes will be operational in the future: regional and national policies continue to support the expansion of Luton Airport.

Your Environmental Assessment states that the site 'may provide affordable housing'. Compatibility with the houses on the opposite (North) side of Colemans Road would suggest 4/5 bedroom dwellings to be more likely. This village, in contrast to others in the vicinity has a higher proportion of terraced and ex-council properties in a lower price bracket.

The altitude and exposure of this site to the South West would result in any building here having an unacceptably adverse effect on the Herts landscape.

All the allotments are under cultivation and allotment holders are drawn from different age groups. Allotments offer the only opportunity for villagers with small gardens to grow their own produce, while reaping the additional benefits of fresh air, exercise and community cooperation.

The local Gardeners' Club is a thriving organisation that contributes much to village life, via talks, horticultural shows, plant sales and helping raise money for the Village Hall. The loss of these allotments would herald the demise of the Club.

National Policy and countryside trends are strongly in favour of the provision of more allotments and encouraging more people to cultivate them. It would be preserve to allow the removal of an integral part of villagers' lives and to deprive the village of this activity.

0920 6 Kings Walden Parish Council

Document Section: Site 49
Representation: *Object*

I write on behalf Kings Walden Parish Council who are strongly objecting to any development on Green Belt Land outside the Boundary agreed in January 2007 and the three parcels of land put forward are all outside this boundary.

The comments made was that the members emphatically stated that there should not be any development outside the envelope as agreed by the Council with Mr Andy Beavan and Mr Richard Kelly in January 2007, my letter to them is enclosed. All three of the suggested sites are outside of this boundary.

The allotments, parcels of land 49 and 51, are well used and I, as Clerk, am constantly being asked how a member of the public can get one, indeed there is a waiting list so it seems when the Government are encouraging us all to be "Greener" that growing ones own would be a much better idea for the environment than building houses, especially as our Parish does not have the facilities or infrastructure to sustain further residents in great numbers.

Breachwood Green has no shopping facilities, nor a doctor, therefore new residents would have to travel for both of these facilities, which does not bring any form of economy to the area but puts more vehicles on the narrow lanes that are always in need of repair. The Bus service is limited.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent

This brings me to parcel of land no. 50. At the end of some residential houses, one of which has use of the entrance as access to the rear. Some of the residents have made parking provision, others have not thus there are vehicles parked on this narrow lane. Only one vehicle can get by when cars are parked in the lane and then "at a squeeze". The land is positioned on a bend therefore any access to development will be hazardous. It is leased by a local resident from Kings Walden Estate and my Council have noticed that although the Estate have put up the suggestion regarding parcels 49 and 51 they have not included parcel 50, therefore permission of the land owner would need to be sought. Perhaps the case is that they along with my Council did not think the area at all suitable. A lorry ban is imposed on this lane, however, being a farming area, large vehicles used in this industry including recovery vehicles, tractors, etc. use the lane, which provides a further danger for users and residents alike.

The Parish Council has received two letters of objection, which I am enclosing, although you should have received these from the residents personally.

As you will see from the above comments, which I hope you will study the suggested areas will not contribute towards promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well being of the area, and look seriously at letting Breachwood Green, nestling within "Green Belt", continue to be a peaceful rural village.

1466 2 Heath

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

Adjacent to the draft villages boundary: this site is well used as a productive allotment-holding site by people with insufficient garden space.

The site is closer to the Airport boundary and affected by the noisiest levels of aircraft noise.

As yet Luton Airport's Master Plan has not materialised by the greatly increased use of the present runway on its present alignment brings aircraft directly in a wide swathe over this area of the village which exacerbates the din.

Due to the elevation of the site any building will be visible over a very wide area of countryside.

Development should be rejected.

General comments relevant to sites 49, 50 and 51 Village of Breachwood Green in the Parish of Kingswalden.

1. Due to the nearness of Luton Airport there is, at many times of the day and night, a great burden of aircraft noise disturbance.
2. The village school has a good record and attracts pupils from a wide area and there is already a full complement of pupils attending.
3. Where country rural sites become available for building there is an apparent trend for the resultant buildings to be large size 'executive' type homes not the modest or affordable homes said to be required and this reveals a flaw in the planning policy.

1696 2 Bretherton

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

sites 49 and 51 Kings Walden

Objections - Both these sites are outside the envelope of the village of Breachwood Green which your planning officer told us (the parishioners of King's Walden) outside of which no development would be permitted. Furthermore they are both allocated allotment holdings which in the current credit crunch are being encouraged by the government to utilise to the full for growing home grown vegetables and produce. This is in addition to them being Greenfield sites classified as grade 3 agricultural land; within groundwater source protection zone 3 and likely to increase commuting and private car use.

1728 2 Beavis

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

Due to its elevation, building development on this site would highly visible from the south-west, would dominate the skyline, and therefore be highly intrusive. It would also be subject to significant aircraft noise.

1753 3 Williamson

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

The allotment site 49 and 51 are being used by the villages doing their best trying to follow the trend to keep the planet green and grow their own food. This small village does not have many amenities but one of the annual highlights is the horticultural show, which brings many people together to compete with their own home grown produce, an age long tradition in village life. The allotments are well supported and in fact here is a waiting list for allotments.

**2848 8 Trustees of Richard
Pilkington**

Warmingtons

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Support*

As owners of Site 49 (together with Sir Thomas Pilkington) we wish to confirm our agreement to the inclusion of this site as one suitable for residential development.

Should the site be zoned and planning permission granted the property could be bought forward at an early date for development.

The development would lead to a modest expansion of the village of Breachwood Green and being only of relatively small proportions could be developed without the infrastructure constraints which in the current climate can make larger developments unviable and undeliverable.

2959 40 English Heritage

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

Site 49 could affect the setting of the Grade II* listed The Old Homestead, although it depends on the exact design of any potential development. We would expect to see development that respects the varied topography surrounding this settlement as well as the linear settlement pattern.

3135 2 Bremner

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

Breachwood Green is not a suitable location for any further housing development: - the lack of facilities & infrastructure, minimal buses, no employment, associated increase in car usage make any further development most undesirable; in particular:

the main road through the village is already heavily congested with parked cars

the access roads to the village comprise very narrow lanes already struggling to carry the existing traffic load

the local school has little or no spare capacity

there are no medical facilities in the village

there are no shopping facilities within the village

the weaknesses already listed on your website

With particular reference to Site No's 49 and 51, both of which comprise garden allotments, the suggestion to develop these sites for housing is totally contrary to current Government policy and to that of many environmental organisations which seek to encourage the use and expansion of garden allotments, whilst the above developments would do the complete

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent
opposite if they were to proceed, as all garden allotment plots in the village would then cease to exist.

3233 **1** **Woodward**

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

We strongly object to this development on the following grounds:

Our house directly overlooks this area of land - for the last 16 years that we have lived in the village the view from the back of our house has been completely unrestricted; this development would be to the detriment of our view.

This development would directly lower the value of our house and we would seek appropriate compensation.

The allotments behind our house have been utilised by various local members of the community for many years; some users are now quite elderly and the allotments are one of their few forms of local recreation. Indeed we thought government policy was to open up more allotments and not close them down.

The building of many houses in this area so close to our houses would cause severe physical and noise pollution over a prolonged period during their construction, and beyond.

We fear that the safety of children playing on Colemans Road would be compromised.

The ambience of Colemans Road and surrounds would be altered beyond repair.

For many years we have been asking for one of the allotments to be cleared of overgrown bramble this has never been done; it now appears that The Kings Walden Estate is finally prepared to do something with the land only because it gives commercial gain to someone.

We had a planning application turned down three miles away from our house in Gustard Wood on the ground of sustainability - we sought one house on a private road which only residents use; now commercial gain can be sought the sustainability argument appears to have been overlooked in this application.

The local village school is currently oversubscribed and has no facility for further expansion; the local school could not accommodate more children without abandoning the sibling rule.

Sales of houses so close to Luton Airport are difficult especially in the current climate.

3233 **2** **Woodward**

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

We strongly object to this development on the following grounds:

Our house directly overlooks this area of land - for the last 16 years that we have lived in the village the view from the back of our house has been completely unrestricted; this development would be to the detriment of our view

This development would directly lower the value of our house and we would seek appropriate compensation

The allotments behind our house have been utilised by various local members of the community for many years; some users are now quite elderly and the allotments are one of their few forms of local recreation. Indeed we thought government policy was to open up more allotments and not close them down.

The building of many houses in this area so close to our houses would cause severe physical and noise pollution over a prolonged period during their construction, and beyond.

We fear that the safety of children playing on Colemans Road would be compromised.

The ambience of Colemans Road and surrounds would be altered beyond repair.

For many years we have been asking for one of the allotments to be cleared of overgrown bramble this has never been done; it now appears that The Kings Walden Estate is finally prepared to do something with the land only because it gives commercial gain to someone

We had a planning application turned down three miles away from our house in Gustard Wood on the ground of sustainability - we sought one house on a private road which only residents use; now commercial gain can be sought the sustainability argument appears to have been overlooked in this application.

The local village school is currently oversubscribed and has no facility for further expansion; the local school could not accommodate more children without abandoning the sibling rule.

Sales of houses so close to Luton Airport are difficult especially in the current climate.

3703 **9** **Wood**

Document Section: Site 49

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Representation: *Object*

1 This site is elevated above and exposed to the countryside to the south west and any building would be highly visible. The impact of significant development on the countryside would, therefore, be unacceptable.

2 The site is subject to high levels of aircraft noise and is likely to fall within Noise Exposure Category (NEC) C of PPG24 by virtue of being a site where individual noise events regularly exceed 82 dB LAmax (S time weighting) several times in any hour at night (footnote to table in paragraph 10 of Annex 1 to PPG24). Planning permission should not normally be granted for sites within NEC C. See my comment on Site 50 for supporting evidence on aircraft noise and comments on potential increases in noise.

**3950 24 Hertfordshire County
Council - Historic
Environment**

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

Requirement for Pre-application or Pre-determination Archaeological Assessment

The sites below have known archaeological remains within them or have archaeological potential. We would therefore wish that - in accordance with Government policy in PPG 16 and the current draft PPS 15 - the LPA requests that pre-application or pre-determination archaeological assessments should be included within all development briefs and other proposals for the sites, if they are formally adopted as development sites in the local development plan. Such assessment would, depending upon the size and location of the proposals, range in scope from additional desk-based research to more extensive archaeological field survey and evaluation. The purpose of the archaeological assessment would be to provide sufficient information about the archaeological resource and in particular the extent of archaeological remains worthy of preservation in situ, to enable the LPA to determine any specific application for development.

**3952 47 Hertfordshire County
Council - Passenger
Transport Unit**

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

Plots 49, 50 & 51: Vehicle access to these plots from the local access roads would be considered acceptable if the access to each plot was located centrally along their frontages taking advantage to maximise the vehicle to vehicle inter visibility. The applicant would have control of the land to each side of the proposed junction this would have to meet the safety requirements of Manual for Streets.

4389 2 Brown & Adams

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

The allotment sites are also an extremely bad idea, given that we are all supposed to be 'doing our bit to save the planet' and to 'be given'. Not only that, they also bring a lot of pleasure to numerable local people, and a lot of hard work has gone into them. If you really want to find alternative sites for building locally, there are others that would be far more sensible, and less opposed.

4425 1 Baker

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

With reference to the 3 proposed development sites in Breachwood Green, we would like to register the following comments.

Re-site 50 paddock in Lower Road. Breachwood Green. This site is on a narrow country lane with cars parking on either side of the lane and cars using it as a short cut to Stevenage and Welwyn causing a potential danger to anyone using the lane especially pedestrians. At the present time a number of residents are allowed to use the paddock to park off the lane. There is also a conservation issue as a number of wild animals can be seen in the paddock e.g. fox, deer, moles and rabbits. We want to keep this village a rural green area and to conserve all wild life.

Sites 49 and 51. At present these two sites are well used allotments we know this for sure as we have been waiting for a plot for two and a half years. Central Government wants everyone to be more active and these proposed sites take away that opportunity from the local people. Other problems that we see with all 3 sites are no shop a limited bus service, no doctors surgery, nearest local is in Whitwell, nearest shops are Hitchin and Luton which means more cars using the already busy small lanes.

4426 1 Farr

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

Considering the government is concerned about the UK not being self-sufficient in food production, building on allotments seems a pretty stupid idea. Breachwood Green does not have the facilities to cope with an influx of people. If housing is to be built in the village IT MUST BE made available to village residents first, at an affordable price, with them given the option to self-build before it is given to a developer.

4759 1 Everett

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

I cannot believe that anyone would seriously consider building houses on the allotment sites in Breachwood Green. Elsewhere in the country people are queuing up, waiting lists in order to rent an allotment, whilst the Government are urging us to "grow our own". Are the people of Breachwood green to be deprived of the opportunity to do just that? I do not have an allotment of my own but share one with a long standing friend, and between us we grow the whole range of vegetables and fruit. The other allotment holders in the village do the same. Apples provide pies for the whole year, some, together with various jams are distributed to various village organisations for a variety of public sales. In addition to depriving us of the benefits of all this home grown bounty, has anyone stopped to consider what effect additional housing would have on our already crowded roads, that are quite dangerous for local people. It is impossible to walk as drive through the village in absolute safety due to the volume of traffic and the growth of roadside parking. We the inhabitants have tried over the years to maintain a village atmosphere here, and will continue to do so.

4871 70 Smith

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

I object to all sites that alter the Green Belt boundary.

I object to the loss of agricultural land for the following reasons:

Food security is now a national priority;

Open green spaces are a valuable amenity for all;

This country has been in breach of European bio-diversity regulations for the past six years;

A survey of rare and endangered species needs to be undertaken;

Fields are necessary for water management.

4963 1 Greet

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

I object to this site being allocated for residential development. The allotments are well-used, providing fresh food for families, the opportunity for fresh air and exercise. The Kings Walden & District Gardeners' Club have their building here, which is their base for storage & distribution. The Club organises talks, shows and plant sales and their activities make an important contribution to the social life of the village. The site is under the flight path of Luton Airport, with resulting noise and pollution.

5002 1 Kateley

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

Allotment areas and prime agricultural land are the last locations which should be given consideration for redevelopment. Green policies are seemingly high on the governments agenda but by even considering these sites, suggests this is not the case. In my book, this is extremely hypocritical and loses votes!

The perimeter around site 49 is also a natural wild life habitat which warns people of this fact not to enter. This would immediately be destroyed upon initiation of any development regardless of what this may entail.

With site 49 situated directly under Luton London flight path, should any housing development be sanctioned, the level of sound proofing required for each property would need to be extremely substantial. It wouldn't be long before major & numerous complaints regarding aircraft noise would become highly contentious.

**5138 1 Kings Walden & District
Gardeners Club**

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

The Kings Walden & District Gardeners' Club objects strongly to the inclusion of the above site as potentially suitable for residential development.

This site is the centre of operations for the Club; their shed there is used for storing and dispensing supplies and the storage of tables and equipment needed for their very popular Spring and Autumn Shows and their annual Plant sale.

All the allotments are under cultivation, providing the opportunity for people with small gardens their own vegetables, salads, fruit and flowers.

The allotment 0 holders and their families benefit from the fresh air and exercise as well as healthy eating. There are also the social benefits of 'communal' gardening, including swapping seeds, plants and produce and sharing refreshments on site. The loss of these benefits would be detrimental to the village and restrict its inhabitants to a much less rewarding life-style.

Your Environmental Assessment states that the site 'may provide affordable housing'. Even if the term were meaningful this would be extremely unlikely since all the houses presently on the North side of Colemans Road are 4/5 bedroom dwellings.

The site is subject to high levels of aircraft noise, individual noise events frequently exceeding 82dB - a noise exposure category that precluded development. The next generation of aircraft are likely to be noisier. Regional and national policies continue to support potential expansion of Luton Airport to the East, which would exacerbate the noise levels.

The adverse impact on the Hertfordshire landscape of building on this site would be unacceptable; the height and exposure to the south west would render it highly visible at a distance. It is in direct opposition to the national trend to propose the loss of allotments when the population as a whole is being encouraged to grow their own food.

We have the full support of the Allotments Association in our objection to this site being designated for building and in our resistance to any moves to deprive the village of this beneficial facility.

5225 1 Bell

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

I wish to register my objection to this development proposal. There are a number of reasons why I believe this site is unsuited to any development, especially residential housing. The foremost of these is the proximity of the site to the flight path for Luton airport. Breachwood Green is blighted by aircraft noise from the airport and there was substantial support for the opposition to the recent airport expansion plans. This particular site is on the airport side of the village (i.e. closer to the airport than most other properties) and almost directly under the flight path. Any houses built on this site would therefore be subject to significant disturbance from aircraft landing and taking off directly overhead. In addition, there would be an

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

increased risk to life in the event of an air traffic accident, which are most likely during take off and landing.

Roads serving the village are narrow and busy at peak times with commuters. Bus services to the nearby towns are infrequent and slow, so therefore are not well supported. Additional housing would be bound to increase private car use and put further pressure on the road network. The village is not well served with amenities with just one pub and no shops. The primary school is over subscribed and struggles to accommodate the resident population. Secondary schools for the village children are in Hitchin and Harpenden. These too are over subscribed and the local children have difficulty in securing admission to their chosen establishments due to the distance we live from these towns.

Another problem with this site is that approximately 25% of the land is currently covered by allotments. I suggest that the current move to encourage more home grown produce to reduce the carbon footprint associated with the food miles would be better served by retaining these allotments. A similar comment could be made for the rest of the land, which is currently used for arable farming.

In conclusion, there seem to be more negatives than positives when considering potential development of this site.

5436 1 Cullen

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

I am protesting most strongly against the outline planning proposals for the expansion of residential building within Breachwood Green that will impinge most detrimentally on the village.

I am objecting on the following grounds:

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Community sensitivity

Scarce amenity

Protection of the Environment

Background

Breachwood Green is a small village approached by four steep roads which are, in places, single track with blind bends. The village is essentially located around four roads; the Heath of which Heath Road and Chapel road are extensions, Oxford Road, Lower Road and Coleman's Road, which leads into Browning's Lane. Considerable residential infilling was carried out in the '60s and '70s and at the same time the creation of St Mary's Rise and Orchard Way.

Area 49: Allotments south of Coleman's Road

This area is a greenfield site and is currently used as allotments. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 3. Some of those that use it have no back gardens in which to grow their own food and these allotments are their only recourse to provide their own fruit and vegetables.

The site is located in Coleman's Road close to the junction with Chapel Road.

The exit from Coleman's Road into Oxford Road is blind to the right hand side as illustrated above and also has a restricted view to the left as illustrated below.

Coleman's Road, onto which a new settlement would enter from the left, is illustrated below. The rural nature of the road itself would be permanently and detrimentally changed. There is a blind bend to the right at the top of this road where it carries on into Brownings Lane and becomes single track.

Close up of blind bend seen at top of picture above.

Looking from the blind bend illustrated above we can see where there is a further blind bend as the road becomes single track, illustrated above and below.

The exit of Coleman's Road, as Brownings Lane, is dangerously blind to both sides.

Blind exit to the right from Coleman's Road as Brownings Lane, which shows on road parking in front of the row of attached cottages in the Heath. The exit to the left, shown below, is also blind.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

The exit from this site is also highly dangerous being blind in both directions as illustrated below.

Increase in traffic congestion by any one of these proposals would be a nightmare.

More settlements increase in carbon dioxide emissions both through car use and general wastes. It is grossly insulting to be told by the UK Government that we must reduce our output of carbon dioxide at the same time as its quangos are imposing these kinds of increases in emissions by forcing the production of new houses on our countryside.

Reduced parking provision often touted to justify affordable housing or new builds is mistaken because it actually increases traffic congestion since, instead of using off-road provision, inappropriate on road parking is used. I have seen where reduced parking provision for housing development has created dangerous roadside obstructions with parked cars.

Community sensitivity

Whilst lip service may be given to the provision of affordable housing for local people, experience shows that unless rented by the local authority or sold leasehold with caveats that only local people can be housed, such housing will inevitably be sold on at market prices. Moreover as far as I am aware there has never been a definition of who qualifies as local and if there is not enough local uptake then clearly the housing will be made available to incomers and the whole justification for building such houses will be betrayed.

The local village community is made up of those whose roots lie in rural communities and those who are in voluntary exile from the urban and suburban rat race. There appears to be no concern over our community's sensitivity to the rural landscape and enjoyment of our homes as required by the Human Rights Act (Articles 8 and 14). In a multicultural democracy equal weight should be given to the needs of rural culture and the sensitivities of the rural community as to any other community.

Over the last 20 years we have seen and resisted a growing pincer movement against our community. There is the current proposed East of Luton expansion, the West of Stevenage expansion, which was successfully opposed only to be imposed by the then MP for Hull East and Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, and the proposed huge expansion of Luton Airport which would have completely destroyed acres of farmland and access from my village to the south.

We now find that there is another proposed expansion from Luton Airport for commercial premises over existing farmland almost to the borders of my home village and finally proposals to squeeze more building into our village. This country is of finite size and cannot continue to support the concreting over of productive and soak land. Moreover we are continually told that we have either reached or will soon reach peak oil. If that is the case, shipment by road, air and sea will become prohibitively expensive and we will have to rely far more, or even exclusively, on locally grown produce. How will that be achieved if our productive land has been swallowed up?

More and more children have no concept of where their food is grown or raised; indeed if it does not come out of a plastic wrapper they are liable to refuse to eat it. A report on the radio only recently indicated that when children were encouraged to grow their own food they were far more amenable to 'eating their greens'. Further building over productive land will distance more and more of our children from appreciating where food comes from and the vital necessity of keeping productive land free of urban development.

Scarce amenity

Allotments are becoming a scarce amenity. The UK's first food security assessment was launched this year by the Government's Department of Food and rural affairs (DEFRA) as part of a package of material on the future of our food system. The material discusses issues ranging from how we can create a sustainable food system locally and globally. It is thus hypocritical to demand that more and more land capable of feeding us is destroyed.

Ironically National Allotment Week took place during this consultation period. This was a week to promote the awareness and availability of allotments both locally and nationally and to show the public and the local authorities the strength of support and interest for the heritage of allotment culture. It was also to promote the social benefits of allotment gardening, which include benefits to health, education and community well-being.

Protection of the Environment

Villages, such as Breachwood Green, and the landscape in which they are situated are unique to the English countryside. Destruction of these landscapes is a desecration of the heritage, character and tradition of England. Just as we accept that buildings of unique historical and architectural beauty and interest should be preserved and conserved so also must the historical landscapes of our country be treated.

The relentless destruction of our natural environment with the creation and spread of settlements caused by an unnatural increase in population pressure, encouraged by politicians, leads to the depletion of our natural resources. As a result our productive land is invaded and degraded. It should be noted that not only is England the most densely populated country in Europe but also as densely populated as Bangladesh.

Moreover, the natural aspiration of people to own cars will increase carbon emissions. Tragically the proposed development will contribute to the destruction of the natural environment, which acts as an organic sink for carbon through the photosynthesis carried out by green plant chlorophyll.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

It must never be forgotten that building such as is proposed can and will never be reversed. When the land is gone it is gone for ever.

It is also blindingly obvious that run-off from the hard surfaces created by building not only causes flooding, by rainwater flowing into river systems that cannot cope with it, but also, thereby, reduces the transport of water through the natural soil, rock and subsurface to replenish natural aquifers. Thus development not only increases flooding but reduces the water table and available ground water. Only in December 2008 the Environment Agency published a report which stated that East Anglia is already considered to be an area of great water stress and that many lakes, estuaries and rivers are drained so quickly that there is a danger to wildlife and that there is already less water available per head in this part of England than those living in Egypt and Morocco. The report says the pressure is greatest in the South East and Eastern England, the driest and most crowded parts of England and Wales.

Summary

If planning permission is given for these sites in Breachwood Green then not only will the already unacceptable congestion in the village become insupportable but also such additional housing will contribute to an increase in local pollution by creating rubbish and sewerage, and through the natural aspiration of people to own cars, increased carbon emissions. Building over agricultural and natural land will also destroy wildlife habitats.

We have a moral and spiritual duty to protect and preserve our natural heritage and to leave a light footprint for future generations who must live in this land. Our natural heritage is also our cultural heritage. Clearly the permanent destruction of food land and soak land will have an ongoing detrimental effect on those who live here both now and in the future.

In addition England's unique countryside with its villages is also a world renowned tourist attraction. I have had visitors who were in awe of the beauty and peacefulness of our local countryside.

It is noteworthy that those who have proposed these sites do not themselves stand to be adversely affected in the enjoyment of their homes.

5546 1 King

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Comment*

Only a quarter of this site is currently allotments. The rest is agricultural land.

Whilst I think it is a good idea to build new houses on allotments (which are 'nice to have' rather than necessary) I object to concreting over agricultural land.

If additional houses are to be built, I think there should be a village shop to enhance the local community and to make it unnecessary to always have to jump in the car to go and buy something.

5590 1 Pilkington

Warmingtons

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Support*

As owner of this site (together with The Trustees of Richard Pilkington) I wish to confirm my agreement to the inclusion of this site as one suitable for residential development.

Should the site be zoned and planning permission granted the property could be bought forward at an early date for development.

The development would lead to a modest expansion of the village of Breachwood Green and being only of relatively small proportions could be developed without the infrastructure constraints which in the current climate can make larger developments unviable and undeliverable.

6066 1 Burkitt

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

1. To destroy our farmland and woodland is short-sighted. We will need to be more self sufficiency in the future. Our agricultural land is precious for crops, livestock & sustainable woodland.

2. Allotment land is very necessary, especially in villages where a lot of people only have small gardens. Everything should be done to retain and promote allotments now and in the

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant
future.

Agent

3. Damage to wildlife by building is significant, not only by loss of habitat but by altering the water table which affects both wildlife and existing buildings, added to which our village infrastructure could not cope with more people.
4. Our school can only just accommodate our children. More people will cause major problems; we would inevitably have the situation where some of our village children would not get places at their own village school!
5. Parking is already at dangerous levels in the school road at delivery and pick-up times. Other village roads are becoming hazardous due to on-road parking.
6. Our ancient village deserves to be kept as a village with local fields kept for agriculture and allotments.

6068 1 King

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

¿ Our house directly overlooks this area of land ¿ since we moved into the village 12 years ago, the view from the rear of our house has been completely unrestricted; this development would be to the detriment of our view.

¿ We were granted planning permission by NHDC in the summer 2008 and have just completed the building works, this proposed development would considerably lower the value of our house and we would seek significant compensation.

¿ The allotments directly behind our house have been utilised by many local members of the community for several years. Some allotment holders are now quite elderly and this is one of their few forms of local recreation and exercise which will be stopped.

¿ We understood that the government policy was to open up more allotments, encouraging people to grow their own produce and for schools and youths to understand where healthy food comes from ¿ how do you propose to replace the allotments?

¿ The building of many houses in this area so close to our house would cause severe physical and noise pollution over a prolonged period during their construction, and beyond.

¿ The current road infrastructure in and out of the village (Darley Hall, Lower Road etc.) would be severely impacted by the increased traffic. It is currently used as a 'rat run' and additional traffic would compromise the safety of the village residents and cause congestion.

¿ The safety of children playing on Colemans Road would be compromised.
The ambience of Colemans Road and surrounds would be altered beyond repair.

¿ For many years our neighbours have requested a small section of overgrown brambles in the allotment directly behind their house be cleared but to no avail. It now appears that The Kings Walden Estate is finally prepared to do something with the land only because it gives commercial gain to someone.

¿ The local village school is currently oversubscribed and has no facility for further expansion; the local school could not accommodate more children without abandoning the sibling rule.

¿ The threat of expansion of Luton Airport has already impacted the sales of houses so close to the airport and this proposal would add to the difficulty especially in the current climate. When we purchased our property, our remit was a cottage in a village with a view of the countryside. We are not going to see our dream home spoilt and strongly object to this development proposal.

Additionally, we are furious and disappointed that we have not received any consultation or notification from the council regarding this proposal. Subject matters that would have such a severe impact on property owners should be addressed on an individual basis in addition to the public notice that was put on the village notice board a week or so after the announcement!

6325 1 Cullen

Document Section: Site 49

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Representation: Object

As a villager and not a NIMBY I am inclined to contact you to ask where on earth the idea for these proposals came from?

The three proposals will without doubt massively increase traffic density in roads that arent capable of taking it and place a huge strain on available roads, services and open spaces.

Site 49 will simply ensure a whole load of traffic uses a single track road to access Luton instead of the main road through the village.

The Lower Road proposal (site 50) is entirely ludicrous in that it is in one of the narrowest most congested lanes in the village on a blind bend!

Site 51 (if any are feasible then this more than the others) but will increase massively the traffic on a road already with wall to wall car parking effectively making it a single track road!

The traffic congestion will be horrendous so they will all use Colemans Lane (see site 49)

The verges are already decimated with Stopsley people cutting through so as to miss the congestion in Luton so what on earth is going to happen when even more local traffic joins it?

What type of housing is proposed? Will the school cope? Will the infrastructure cope? Will the inadequate roads cope? Will the environment cope? Will the utilities cope?

I will object very strongly (along with the whole village) if these proposals gain any credence.

The mix of housing in the village is about right with starter homes through to fine detached residences. There has been no wholesale building in this Green Belt area for many years as it is a naturally evolving village in a beautiful part of the world and is relatively unaffected by crass, ill thought out development and although you state that there is no environmental issue or wildlife issue you are wrong!

The extraction from the Mimram is already severe and you now want to add 50 - 100 households to this area - madness, how does it all add up?

The Bedfordshire expansion threatens the Lilley Bottom Road valley as you are all too weak willed to stand up to them and tell them to bu**er off our county and then have the nerve to ask us to accommodate social mixed housing (for I bet that's what it will be) when the current Luton infrastructure and access to the M1 is already inadequate. Social mixed housing will alter the natural demographic nature of the village and will not necessarily add villagers with respect for the country, property and their fellow villagers!!!!!!!!!!!!

Why not develop around Stevenage for God's sake, it's got land a plenty around it and the A1 running through it!!!

Note that if it is fact that a local villager, a Mr Roger Wood, proposed site 50 then be aware that no-one in this village was consulted by him, no one locally was consulted by him so I do not understand where his interests lie or his reasons for springing this on us! We will undoubtedly be discussing this with him!

6342 1 Titmuss and Rookwood

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: Object

We would like to object to the potential development on Sites 49, 50 and 51 all of which are in Breachwood Green where we live.

Breachwood Green does not have the facilities to accommodate more houses/residents, the small village school and pre-school are already full and if more residents were in the village it would eventually mean that local children would not be able to get into their own village school.

We already have to live with the noise of Luton Airport and the huge amount of traffic that bypasses through the village between Luton and Hitchin, if development took place in Breachwood Green this would mean an increase in the traffic, noise and pollution on our village.

Development would have a negative effect on our countryside, wild animals/birds and plants which are all peacefully living in our village. Many residents' home gardens are so small that they rely on the allotments for fresh fruit/vegetables and also relaxation, therefore to build on them would be a huge shame for all.

All of our agricultural land is very precious to everyone and is imperative for future self-sufficiency. To develop on it seems very short-sighted, we should be preserving this land not building on it.

The current parking facilities in Breachwood Green are very limited. On The Heath there is already nose-to-tail parking on one side resulting in the road being 'one-way' traffic. If development were to take place this would mean more cars and more residents and would increase the chances of somebody being injured.

6347 1 Bowles

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: Object

Area 49: Allotments south of Coleman's Road

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

This area is a greenfield site and is currently used as allotments. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 3. Some of those that use it have no back gardens in which to grow their own food and these allotments are their only recourse to provide their own fruit and vegetables.

The site is located in Coleman's Road close to the junction with Chapel Road.

The exit from Coleman's Road into Oxford Road is blind to the right hand side as illustrated above and also has a restricted view to the left as illustrated below.

Coleman's Road, onto which a new settlement would enter from the left, is illustrated below. The rural nature of the road itself would be permanently and detrimentally changed. There is a blind bend to the right at the top of this road where it carries on into Brownings Lane and becomes single track.

Close up of blind bend seen at top of picture above.

Looking from the blind bend illustrated above we can see where there is a further blind bend as the road becomes single track, illustrated above and below.

The exit of Coleman's Road, as Brownings Lane, is dangerously blind to both sides.

Blind exit to the right from Coleman's Road as Brownings Lane, which shows on road parking in front of the row of attached cottages in the Heath. The exit to the left, shown below, is also blind.

6357 1 Rochford and Fossey

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: Object

I will treat these on the same basis. They are both allotment sites but site 49 also includes an adjacent tract of land. I strongly object to both of these sites being offered for future residential development.

This proposal is outrageous when it will deprive the village of a valuable amenity, in particular for the elderly whose hobby and interest will be taken away, not to mention the loss of food that they grow for themselves and others. Any notion that alternative land will be provided by The Estate for allotments is not an option when you consider that the current allotment users have put time, effort and money into the existing plots and have achieved a quality of cultivation that will take years to attain on a new site.

Added to that, the government has just published a white paper on self sufficiency for food production in the UK which highlights the use of allotments and land sharing to make a valuable contribution to our food sourcing without resort to importing. This includes the fact that home production of food will cut down on transport and helps with carbon emission targets to be met.

At the moment there is a waiting list for allotments in the UK which is increasing. Home food production popularity is rising and yet, this proposal from King's Walden Estate wants to ignore that and take away this from people who enjoy their pastime and benefit the economy and the environment. Scandalous!

But, in addition to these facts, the possible development of these two sites raises other issues.

Increased traffic from new residents, their visitors and trade vehicles on narrow rural roads already burdened by increased usage from 'rat running' at peak times and from the use of satellite navigation by people would never venture onto such roads in the past.

Both sites are very close to the Luton Airport flight path and make them less attractive for potential purchasers. Additional people would now be at risk from possible air accidents and from the pollution from aircraft emissions.

6391 2 Davies

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: Object

Area 49: Allotments south of Coleman's Road

This area is a greenfield site and is currently used as allotments. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 3. Some of those that use it have no back gardens in which to grow their own food and these allotments are their only recourse to provide their own fruit and vegetables.

The site is located in Coleman's Road close to the junction with Chapel Road.

The exit from Coleman's Road into Oxford Road is blind to the right hand side as illustrated above and also has a restricted view to the left as illustrated below.

Coleman's Road, onto which a new settlement would enter from the left, is illustrated below. The rural nature of the road itself would be permanently and detrimentally changed. There is a blind bend to the right at the top of this road where it carries on into Brownings Lane and becomes single track.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 49

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Close up of blind bend seen at top of picture above.

Looking from the blind bend illustrated above we can see where there is a further blind bend as the road becomes single track, illustrated above and below.

The exit of Coleman's Road, as Brownings Lane, is dangerously blind to both sides.

Blind exit to the right from Coleman's Road as Brownings Lane, which shows on road parking in front of the row of attached cottages in the Heath. The exit to the left, shown below, is also blind.

6401 1 Burkitt

Document Section: Site 49

Representation: *Object*

These three proposed sites are within the village of Breachwood Green, building houses on any of them would further degrade the quality of village life.

1. The village infrastructure is already overloaded, in particular The Heath and Heath Road are now virtually one way roads because of continuous car parking. Additional housing would further increase this congestion.
2. The village school in Oxford Road is already full, I understand that some village children were only admitted on appeal last year. There is no room for further expansion and again Oxford Road would be unable to cope with the additional congestion that further expansion would cause.
3. The UK needs more, not less farmland and allotments. Each of these three proposed sites is valuable and its removal would be a great loss to our village.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Agent</u>
0365	68	Natural England - East of England Region	

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Comment*

This site appears to be directly adjacent to the County Wildlife Site 28/006 Watkins Wood/Lords Wood, and any potential adverse impacts on the site from development would need to be addressed.

0417 **4** **Long**

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Support*

As the owners of this site we support the suggestion of this site as a potential residential develop site.

Correction to Appendix 4: Site Allocation Matrices; it refers to retaining as many trees on the site as possible and retaining public right of way, currently there are no trees on the site and there is no public right of way through the site.

Other points which we think make this an effective site are:-

- well defined area, would form a new natural boundary to village, unlikely to lead to future expansion;
- existing regularly used safe access;
- all services close at hand;
- not currently used as agriculture land;
- increase support for village services school, pub, post office, village hall;
- although work commuting could increase, commuting to the local school could decrease;
- a small development would relate well to the existing varied village housing.

0459 **100** **CPRE - The Hertfordshire Society**

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

This site is in the Green Belt and is outside the identified village boundary for Breachwood Green proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (September 2007). No justification for its release for development has been provided.

0571 **7** **The Breachwood Green Society**

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

This site is highly unsuitable for residential development, due to its location on a blind bend of a narrow lane at the North East edge of the village. Access and egress of vehicles using this site would be extremely hazardous to them as well as for traffic approaching or leaving the village.

The rural, wooded character of this road enhances the approach to the village. Cautious driving is encouraged by its alignment and lack of width; were it to be altered, speeds would increase through the village and on the very narrow downhill stretch leading away from the settlement.

The site has been leased privately for many years to a village resident and is in constant use for dog-training.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent
This area of the village experiences high noise levels from planes taking off and landing at Luton Airport.

**0920 7 Kings Walden Parish
Council**

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

I write on behalf Kings Walden Parish Council who are strongly objecting to any development on Green Belt Land outside the Boundary agreed in January 2007 and the three parcels of land put forward are all outside this boundary.

The comments made was that the members emphatically stated that there should not be any development outside the envelope as agreed by the Council with Mr Andy Beavan and Mr Richard Kelly in January 2007, my letter to them is enclosed. All three of the suggested sites are outside of this boundary.

The allotments, parcels of land 49 and 51, are well used and I, as Clerk, am constantly being asked how a member of the public can get one, indeed there is a waiting list so it seems when the Government are encouraging us all to be "Greener" that growing ones own would be a much better idea for the environment than building houses, especially as our Parish does not have the facilities or infrastructure to sustain further residents in great numbers.

Breachwood Green has no shopping facilities, nor a doctor, therefore new residents would have to travel for both of these facilities, which does not bring any form of economy to the area but puts more vehicles on the narrow lanes that are always in need of repair. The Bus service is limited.

This brings me to parcel of land no. 50. At the end of some residential houses, one of which has use of the entrance as access to the rear. Some of the residents have made parking provision, others have not thus there are vehicles parked on this narrow lane. Only one vehicle can get by when cars are parked in the lane and then "at a squeeze". The land is positioned on a bend therefore any access to development will be hazardous. It is leased by a local resident from Kings Walden Estate and my Council have noticed that although the Estate have put up the suggestion regarding parcels 49 and 51 they have not included parcel 50, therefore permission of the land owner would need to be sought. Perhaps the case is that they along with my Council did not think the area at all suitable. A lorry ban is imposed on this lane, however, being a farming area, large vehicles used in this industry including recovery vehicles, tractors, etc. use the lane, which provides a further danger for users and residents alike.

The Parish Council has received two letters of objection, which I am enclosing, although you should have received these from the residents personally.

As you will see from the above comments, which I hope you will study the suggested areas will not contribute towards promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well being of the area, and look seriously at letting Breachwood Green, nestling within "Green Belt", continue to be a peaceful rural village.

1466 3 Heath

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

This site adjoins the village boundary but development would create an extension elongating the settlement and not fulfilling the criteria of more cohesion.

The site is on a slope on one side of a steep hill between two pronounced bends. This road is a sunken lane and is one of the lesser access roads into the village.

The bends and the topography do not permit a view of the extent of the lane and its length from top to bottom. Development here would be hazardous for traffic.

There are steep banks on each side and the branches of the trees meet overhead. It is picturesque and characteristic of the local Hertfordshire lanes and contributes to an enjoyable

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant
countryside experience.

Agent

People enjoy it for walking and children enjoy the mysteries of the dark woods.

There is no space for pavements on either side of the road but I do not know of anyone who lives on this road who wishes it to be turned into an urban style straight run. Indeed, the bends and high banks serve to prevent the hill from being used as a regular 'rat-run' up into and through the village en route to Luton.

General comments relevant to sites 49, 50 and 51 Village of Breachwood Green in the Parish of Kingswalden.

1. Due to the nearness of Luton Airport there is, at many times of the day and night, a great burden of aircraft noise disturbance.
2. The village school has a good record and attracts pupils from a wide area and there is already a full complement of pupils attending.
3. Where country rural sites become available for building there is an apparent trend for the resultant buildings to be large size 'executive' type homes not the modest or affordable homes said to be required and this reveals a flaw in the planning policy.

1696 4 Bretherton

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Object

Site 50 - King's Walden

Objections - Besides being put forward by a person who does not own the land the owner has no wish to develop the site. It fronts an extremely narrow lane on to which any further exits would cause unacceptable traffic hazards. It is also outside the envelope of the village of Breachwood Green which your planning officer stated categorically last February no development would be permitted. Furthermore it is a greenfield site grade 3 agricultural land and is within groundwater source protection zone 2.

1728 3 Beavis

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Object

Any increase in traffic in Lower Road, a very narrow lane winding between property boundaries, would be very hazardous. This site would also be subject to considerable aircraft noise.

1753 4 Williamson

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Comment

Regarding the proposed site No. 50 in Lower Road.

Any residential development of the site would lead to no economic well being of the area, Breachwood Green has no shops and any development of the housing on the proposed site can have no economic benefit as new residents would have no alternative but to shop in either of the nearest towns Hitchin or Luton.

Lower Road at the present time is a typical road located in any village, the nearest Council housing development is in Orchard Way and thus any further development in Lower Road cannot lead to the social well-being of the area.

Lower Road adjacent to the proposed site is narrow and winding. Cars are parked on either side of the road at all times and because of the bends in the road driving is difficult. Drivers going both ways at times are driving blind to on coming traffic especially on the road where the proposed site abuts. In addition notwithstanding the narrow road heavy traffic eg. tractors and recovery vehicles are frequently seen although there is a lorry ban on the road. Any residential development of the site will exacerbate the situation.

3135 3 Bremner

Document Section: Site 50

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Representation: Object

Breachwood Green is not a suitable location for any further housing development: - the lack of facilities & infrastructure, minimal buses, no employment, associated increase in car usage make any further development most undesirable; in particular:
the main road through the village is already heavily congested with parked cars
the access roads to the village comprise very narrow lanes already struggling to carry the existing traffic load
the local school has little or no spare capacity
there are no medical facilities in the village
there are no shopping facilities within the village
the weaknesses already listed on your website

With particular reference to Site No's 49 and 51, both of which comprise garden allotments, the suggestion to develop these sites for housing is totally contrary to current Government policy and to that of many environmental organisations which seek to encourage the use and expansion of garden allotments, whilst the above developments would do the complete opposite if they were to proceed, as all garden allotment plots in the village would then cease to exist.

3703 8 Wood

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Comment

As the proposer of this site, I continue to support it for residential use but within the following constraints:

- 1 Any proposal for development should provide some planning gain to:
 - a. Improve the alignment of Lower Road to enhance safety on this well-used access to the village; and
 - b. Provide parking space for existing residents of nearby cottages with no off-street parking.
- 2 The site should not be identified for residential development until a proper assessment of aircraft noise at this location has been carried out. Data published by NATS in March 2008* indicates that the location may fall within Noise Exposure Category (NEC) C of PPG24 by virtue of being a site where individual noise events regularly exceed 82 dB LAmax (S time weighting) several times in any hour at night (footnote to table in paragraph 10 of Annex 1 to PPG24). Planning permission should not normally be granted for sites within NEC C. The next generation of larger aircraft which will operate in the main fleets flying from Luton, the Boeing 787 and Airbus A350, may well be noisier than the current fleets and Regional. Regional and National policies both support potential expansion of the Airport through a runway extension to the east which would significantly exacerbate the noise levels at this location.

* This comment is based on information in the NATS document Modelled changes to Sound Exposure Levels (or SELs) for the Luton routes affected by the Terminal Control North (TCN) Proposal 3044/RPT/29 Issue 1. This gives noise contours using the SEL metric which cannot be directly converted to LAmax (S time weighting) but, based on measurements at Breachwood Green, LADACAN estimates that LAmax (S) would be 7 dBA lower for departures. The typical aircraft used by NATS, the Boeing 737-700 is being phased out from the main fleets at Luton in favour of the noisier Boeing 737-800 and Airbus A319 and A320 aircraft.

**3950 22 Hertfordshire County
Council - Historic
Environment**

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Comment

Requirement for Pre-application or Pre-determination Archaeological Assessment

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

The sites below have known archaeological remains within them or have archaeological potential. We would therefore wish that - in accordance with Government policy in PPG 16 and the current draft PPS 15 - the LPA requests that pre-application or pre-determination archaeological assessments should be included within all development briefs and other proposals for the sites, if they are formally adopted as development sites in the local development plan. Such assessment would, depending upon the size and location of the proposals, range in scope from additional desk-based research to more extensive archaeological field survey and evaluation. The purpose of the archaeological assessment would be to provide sufficient information about the archaeological resource and in particular the extent of archaeological remains worthy of preservation in situ, to enable the LPA to determine any specific application for development.

**3952 48 Hertfordshire County
Council - Passenger
Transport Unit**

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Comment*

Plots 49, 50 & 51: Vehicle access to these plots from the local access roads would be considered acceptable if the access to each plot was located centrally along their frontages taking advantage to maximise the vehicle to vehicle inter visibility. The applicant would have control of the land to each side of the proposed junction this would have to meet the safety requirements of Manual for Streets.

4389 1 Brown & Adams

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

As the householder of the above address I most strongly object to the planning permission being granted to the area described as area 50 on the map. The access road is dangerous even at present, with a blind bend and a slippery and often in winter time non-negotiable hill. The parking is chaos, for the whole of Lower Road. At present the field is used for dog agility, and brings a lot of pleasure to local people. Also the current person who rents it allows others to park their cars there, to alleviate the terrible parking conditions.

4425 2 Baker

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Comment*

With reference to the 3 proposed development sites in Breachwood Green, we would like to register the following comments.

Re-site 50 paddock in Lower Road. Breachwood Green. This site is on a narrow country lane with cars parking on either side of the lane and cars using it as a short cut to Stevenage and Welwyn causing a potential danger to anyone using the lane especially pedestrians. At the present time a number of residents are allowed to use the paddock to park off the lane. There is also a conservation issue as a number of wild animals can be seen in the paddock e.g. fox, deer, moles and rabbits. We want to keep this village a rural green area and to conserve all wild life.

Sites 49 and 51. At present these two sites are well used allotments we know this for sure as we have been waiting for a plot for two and a half years. Central Government wants everyone to be more active and these proposed sites take away that opportunity from the local people. Other problems that we see with all 3 sites are no shop a limited bus service, no doctors surgery, nearest local is in Whitwell, nearest shops are Hitchin and Luton which means more cars using the already busy small lanes.

4426 3 Farr

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Comment*

Out of the three sites in Breachwood, building on this one would probably be the least disruptive. However, the road to this area is very narrow with sharp bends. The road would have

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

to be improved before any more housing could be built. For Breachwood to support a significant increase in population the facilities in the village would need to be reviewed / improved.

4871 69 Smith

Document Section:Site 50

Representation: *Object*

I object to all sites that alter the Green Belt boundary.

I object to the loss of agricultural land for the following reasons:

Food security is now a national priority;

Open green spaces are a valuable amenity for all;

This country has been in breach of European bio-diversity regulations for the past six years;

A survey of rare and endangered species needs to be undertaken;

Fields are necessary for water management.

4963 2 Greet

Document Section:Site 50

Representation: *Object*

I object to this site since its location on a blind bend of a narrow lane on the edge of the village would create a danger spot for traffic, whether passing through or generated by housing on the site.

5436 2 Cullen

Document Section:Site 50

Representation: *Object*

I am protesting most strongly against the outline planning proposals for the expansion of residential building within Breachwood Green that will impinge most detrimentally on the village.

I am objecting on the following grounds:

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Community sensitivity

Scarce amenity

Protection of the Environment

Background

Breachwood Green is a small village approached by four steep roads which are, in places, single track with blind bends. The village is essentially located around four roads; the Heath of which Heath Road and Chapel road are extensions, Oxford Road, Lower Road and Coleman's Road, which leads into Browning's Lane. Considerable residential infilling was carried out in the '60s and '70s and at the same time the creation of St Mary's Rise and Orchard Way.

Area 50: Land north of Lower Road

This area is a greenfield site and in constant use either as pasture or as a dog training ground and is thus a useful amenity within the village. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 2. It debouches onto a very narrow road with blind corners in each direction.

Blind bend to the left on approach to site shown above and continuation of the road to the site shown below.

Note 5-barred gate entrance to proposed site immediately before blind bend on single track road.

Blind bend in approach to site, looking back from site entrance.

Blind bend to the left of the exit from proposed site on single track road.

This site has been proposed by someone who is not the owner and it is also of note that this person has not proposed any site that would affect the amenity they enjoy in their property.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Increase in traffic congestion by any one of these proposals would be a nightmare.

More settlements increase in carbon dioxide emissions both through car use and general wastes. It is grossly insulting to be told by the UK Government that we must reduce our output of carbon dioxide at the same time as its quangos are imposing these kinds of increases in emissions by forcing the production of new houses on our countryside.

Reduced parking provision often touted to justify affordable housing or new builds is mistaken because it actually increases traffic congestion since, instead of using off-road provision, inappropriate on road parking is used. I have seen where reduced parking provision for housing development has created dangerous roadside obstructions with parked cars.

Community sensitivity

Whilst lip service may be given to the provision of affordable housing for local people, experience shows that unless rented by the local authority or sold leasehold with caveats that only local people can be housed, such housing will inevitably be sold on at market prices. Moreover as far as I am aware there has never been a definition of who qualifies as local and if there is not enough local uptake then clearly the housing will be made available to incomers and the whole justification for building such houses will be betrayed.

The local village community is made up of those whose roots lie in rural communities and those who are in voluntary exile from the urban and suburban rat race. There appears to be no concern over our community's sensitivity to the rural landscape and enjoyment of our homes as required by the Human Rights Act (Articles 8 and 14). In a multicultural democracy equal weight should be given to the needs of rural culture and the sensitivities of the rural community as to any other community.

Over the last 20 years we have seen and resisted a growing pincer movement against our community. There is the current proposed East of Luton expansion, the West of Stevenage expansion, which was successfully opposed only to be imposed by the then MP for Hull East and Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, and the proposed huge expansion of Luton Airport which would have completely destroyed acres of farmland and access from my village to the south.

We now find that there is another proposed expansion from Luton Airport for commercial premises over existing farmland almost to the borders of my home village and finally proposals to squeeze more building into our village. This country is of finite size and cannot continue to support the concreting over of productive and soak land. Moreover we are continually told that we have either reached or will soon reach peak oil. If that is the case, shipment by road, air and sea will become prohibitively expensive and we will have to rely far more, or even exclusively, on locally grown produce. How will that be achieved if our productive land has been swallowed up?

More and more children have no concept of where their food is grown or raised; indeed if it does not come out of a plastic wrapper they are liable to refuse to eat it. A report on the radio only recently indicated that when children were encouraged to grow their own food they were far more amenable to 'eating their greens'. Further building over productive land will distance more and more of our children from appreciating where food comes from and the vital necessity of keeping productive land free of urban development.

Scarce amenity

Allotments are becoming a scarce amenity. The UK's first food security assessment was launched this year by the Government's Department of Food and rural affairs (DEFRA) as part of a package of material on the future of our food system. The material discusses issues ranging from how we can create a sustainable food system locally and globally. It is thus hypocritical to demand that more and more land capable of feeding us is destroyed.

Ironically National Allotment Week took place during this consultation period. This was a week to promote the awareness and availability of allotments both locally and nationally and to show the public and the local authorities the strength of support and interest for the heritage of allotment culture. It was also to promote the social benefits of allotment gardening, which include benefits to health, education and community well-being.

Protection of the Environment

Villages, such as Breachwood Green, and the landscape in which they are situated are unique to the English countryside. Destruction of these landscapes is a desecration of the heritage, character and tradition of England. Just as we accept that buildings of unique historical and architectural beauty and interest should be preserved and conserved so also must the historical landscapes of our country be treated.

The relentless destruction of our natural environment with the creation and spread of settlements caused by an unnatural increase in population pressure, encouraged by politicians, leads to the depletion of our natural resources. As a result our productive land is invaded and degraded. It should be noted that not only is England the most densely populated country in Europe but also as densely populated as Bangladesh.

Moreover, the natural aspiration of people to own cars will increase carbon emissions. Tragically the proposed development will contribute to the destruction of the natural environment, which acts as an organic sink for carbon through the photosynthesis carried out by green plant chlorophyll.

It must never be forgotten that building such as is proposed can and will never be reversed. When the land is gone it is gone for ever.

It is also blindingly obvious that run-off from the hard surfaces created by building not only causes flooding, by rainwater flowing into river systems that cannot cope with it, but also,

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

thereby, reduces the transport of water through the natural soil, rock and subsurface to replenish natural aquifers. Thus development not only increases flooding but reduces the water table and available ground water. Only in December 2008 the Environment Agency published a report which stated that East Anglia is already considered to be an area of great water stress and that many lakes, estuaries and rivers are drained so quickly that there is a danger to wildlife and that there is already less water available per head in this part of England than those living in Egypt and Morocco. The report says the pressure is greatest in the South East and Eastern England, the driest and most crowded parts of England and Wales.

Summary

If planning permission is given for these sites in Breachwood Green then not only will the already unacceptable congestion in the village become insupportable but also such additional housing will contribute to an increase in local pollution by creating rubbish and sewerage, and through the natural aspiration of people to own cars, increased carbon emissions. Building over agricultural and natural land will also destroy wildlife habitats.

We have a moral and spiritual duty to protect and preserve our natural heritage and to leave a light footprint for future generations who must live in this land. Our natural heritage is also our cultural heritage. Clearly the permanent destruction of food land and soak land will have an ongoing detrimental effect on those who live here both now and in the future.

In addition England's unique countryside with its villages is also a world renowned tourist attraction. I have had visitors who were in awe of the beauty and peacefulness of our local countryside.

It is noteworthy that those who have proposed these sites do not themselves stand to be adversely affected in the enjoyment of their homes.

5546 2 King

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Comment*

There are already houses on both sides of Lower Road so this site would, in my view, be a natural extension to the village. However, Lower Road is very narrow, so would have to be widened in order to provide safe access to and from these additional houses. Widening the road would mean having to take over some of the agricultural land on either side of Lower Road. Whilst not ideal, at least it would not require getting rid of a huge amount of agricultural land.

If additional houses are to be built, I think there should be a village shop to enhance the local community and to make it unnecessary to always have to jump in the car to go and buy something.

6066 2 Burkitt

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

1. To destroy our farmland and woodland is short-sighted. We will need to be more self sufficiency in the future. Our agricultural land is precious for crops, livestock & sustainable woodland.

2. Allotment land is very necessary, especially in villages where a lot of people only have small gardens. Everything should be done to retain and promote allotments now and in the future.

3. Damage to wildlife by building is significant, not only by loss of habitat but by altering the water table which affects both wildlife and existing buildings, added to which our village infrastructure could not cope with more people.

4. Our school can only just accommodate our children. More people will cause major problems; we would inevitably have the situation where some of our village children would not get places at their own village school!

5. Parking is already at dangerous levels in the school road at delivery and pick-up times. Other village roads are becoming hazardous due to on-road parking.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent
6. Our ancient village deserves to be kept as a village with local fields kept for agriculture and allotments.

6250 1 Cameron

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

- Site 50 is outside the Green Belt. □- Traditional agricultural land. □- No services infrastructure. □- The site is on a narrow country lane with two dangerous blind bends. □- The site would be unable to cope with the additional traffic flow. □- There is no local demand for additional residential development outside the village green belt, infilling meets the need of the village. □- Development would affect nature conservation within an area of outstanding natural beauty.

6325 2 Cullen

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

As a villager and not a NIMBY I am inclined to contact you to ask where on earth the idea for these proposals came from?

The three proposals will without doubt massively increase traffic density in roads that arent capable of taking it and place a huge strain on available roads, services and open spaces.

Site 49 will simply ensure a whole load of traffic uses a single track road to access Luton instead of the main road through the village.

The Lower Road proposal (site 50) is entirely ludicrous in that it is in one of the narrowest most congested lanes in the village on a blind bend!

Site 51 (if any are feasible then this more than the others) but will increase massively the traffic on a road already with wall to wall car parking effectively making it a single track road!

The traffic congestion will be horrendous so they will all use Colemans Lane (see site 49)

The verges are already decimated with Stopsley people cutting through so as to miss the congestion in Luton so what on earth is going to happen when even more local traffic joins it?

What type of housing is proposed? Will the school cope? Will the infrastructure cope? Will the inadequate roads cope? Will the environment cope? Will the utilities cope?

I will object very strongly (along with the whole village) if these proposals gain any credence.

The mix of housing in the village is about right with starter homes through to fine detached residences. There has been no wholesale building in this Green Belt area for many years as it is a naturally evolving village in a beautiful part of the world and is relatively unaffected by crass, ill thought out development and although you state that there is no environmental issue or wildlife issue you are wrong!

The extraction from the Mimram is already severe and you now want to add 50 - 100 households to this area - madness, how does it all add up?

The Bedfordshire expansion threatens the Lilley Bottom Road valley as you are all too weak willed to stand up to them and tell them to bu**er off our county and then have the nerve to ask us to accomodate social mixed housing (for I bet thats what it will be) when the current Luton infrastructure and access to the M1 is already inadequate. Social mixed housing will alter the natural demographic nature of the village and will not necessarily add villagers with respect for the country, property and their fellow villagers!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Why not develop around Stevenage for Gods sake, its got land a plenty around it and the A1 running through it!!!

Note that if it is fact that a local villager, a Mr Roger Wood, proposed site 50 then be aware that no-one in this village was consulted by him, no one locally was consulted by him so I do not understand where his interests lie or his reasons for springing this on us! We will undoubtedly be discussing this with him!

6342 2 Titmuss and Rookwood

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

e would like to object to the potential development on Sites 49, 50 and 51 all of which are in Breachwood Green where we live.

Breachwood Green does not have the facilities to accomodate more houses/residents, the small village school and pre-school are already full and if more residents were in the village it would eventually mean that local children would not be able to get into their own village school.

We already have to live with the noise of Luton Airport and the huge amount of traffic that bypasses through the village between Luton and Hitchin, if development took place in Breachwood Green this would mean an increase the traffic, noise and pollution on our village.

Development would have a negative effect on our countryside, wild animals/birds and plants which are all peacefully living in our village. Many residents' home gardens are so small that

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

they rely on the allotments for fresh fruit/vegetables and also relaxation, therefore to build on them would be a huge shame for all.

All of our agricultural land is very precious to everyone and is imperative for future self-sufficiency. To develop on it seems very short-sighted, we should be preserving this land not building on it.

The current parking facilities in Breachwood Green are very limited. On The Heath there is already nose-to-tail parking on one side resulting in the road being 'one-way' traffic. If development were to take place this would mean more cars and more residents and would increase the chances of somebody being injured.

6347 2 Bowles

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

Area 50: Land north of Lower Road

This area is a greenfield site and in constant use either as pasture or as a dog training ground and is thus a useful amenity within the village. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 2. It debouches onto a very narrow road with blind corners in each direction.

Blind bend to the left on approach to site shown above and continuation of the road to the site shown below.

Note 5-barred gate entrance to proposed site immediately before blind bend on single track road.

Blind bend in approach to site, looking back from site entrance.

Blind bend to the left of the exit from proposed site on single track road.

This site has been proposed by someone who is not the owner and it is also of note that this person has not proposed any site that would affect the amenity they enjoy in their property.

6357 3 Rochford and Fossey

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: *Object*

This site is currently a paddock and approximately one third used by a local resident for a dog agility and training facility. I strongly object to the loss of this paddock to residential development on that and the following grounds.

The paddock is on the narrow bottom end of Lower Road and adjacent to two of the most dangerous blind bends in the area. These have been the scene of many minor RTA's in the 19 years I have lived here and continue to provide frightening near misses on a regular basis. Road access to this site would be difficult and dangerous both during a construction phase and afterwards the increased traffic from residents and visitors would cause a real danger on such a narrow road with poor visibility. Also, there is another bend above this section of the road that is equally dangerous. On this basis alone, the proposal to develop this site would be madness. Some 25 years ago, planning was submitted for housing development and turned down at government level on appeal, because of the road. Traffic has increased by a huge amount since then and presents an even greater danger now.

At present the paddock serves another purpose, and that is to provide off road parking for residents and their visitors by courtesy of the lady who rents the paddock. This is an asset that if lost would create a parking issue. Where would current residents and their visitors park if this was not available? And with the increased traffic from the new development, where would they park?

If construction was to go ahead, it would be a nightmare for those living here and those who are involved in it. The position of the site is not suited to construction by virtue of the limits of road access.

As regards the question of wildlife which your strengths state is not an issue, then you have glibly just looked at this from a brief observation. The paddock serves a large variety of wildlife. The large population of tawny owls that live in Lords Wood behind use this for hunting all the time as does the odd barn owl. Fallow deer jump the fence in the winter months and use it for grazing when vegetation is scarce. Very important though would be the loss of the boundary hedge by the roadside that is a mixture of elder, hawthorn and bramble. This is host to many birds but significantly, a colony of sparrows breed and roost there. All this would be lost.

As with the other two allotment sites, the paddock is close to the Luton Airport flight path and makes it less attractive for potential purchasers. Additional people would now be at risk from possible air accidents and from the pollution from aircraft emissions.

6386 1 Plummer

Document Section: Site 50

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 50

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Representation: Object

I am appalled at the info I have just received. It appears that a certain councillor is trying to push a ridiculous plan through to develop green belt land in Lower road Breachwood Green. This councillor may not have made you aware just how closely tied he is to the land owner who owns a plot that is Green belt and in the worst location for planning. I can assure you there will be a many people ensuring that this ridiculous plan does not go through and for many reasons. The councillor in question is unprofessional in suggesting this plot to be the best option and North herts will be getting some bad press on 3CR, our website and in local news should this look like it may go ahead.

6391 3 Davies

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Object

Area 50: Land north of Lower Road

This area is a greenfield site and in constant use either as pasture or as a dog training ground and is thus a useful amenity within the village. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 2. It debouches onto a very narrow road with blind corners in each direction.

Blind bend to the left on approach to site shown above and continuation of the road to the site shown below.

Note 5-barred gate entrance to proposed site immediately before blind bend on single track road.

Blind bend in approach to site, looking back from site entrance.

Blind bend to the left of the exit from proposed site on single track road.

This site has been proposed by someone who is not the owner and it is also of note that this person has not proposed any site that would affect the amenity they enjoy in their property.

6401 2 Burkitt

Document Section: Site 50

Representation: Object

These three proposed sites are within the village of Breachwood Green, building houses on any of them would further degrade the quality of village life.

1. The village infrastructure is already overloaded, in particular The Heath and Heath Road are now virtually one way roads because of continuous car parking. Additional housing would further increase this congestion.
2. The village school in Oxford Road is already full, I understand that some village children were only admitted on appeal last year. There is no room for further expansion and again Oxford Road would be unable to cope with the additional congestion that further expansion would cause.
3. The UK needs more, not less farmland and allotments. Each of these three proposed sites is valuable and its removal would be a great loss to our village.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent
0459 101 CPRE - The Hertfordshire Society

Document Section: Site 51
Representation: *Object*

This site is in the Green Belt. Its release would allow linear development to extend along Heath Road towards Breachwood Green.

0571 8 The Breachwood Green Society

Document Section: Site 51
Representation: *Object*

These allotments are well-used by local residents to provide fresh food for their families. The annual Spring and Autumn horticultural shows would not be viable without entries of produce grown here: these events, popular with the whole community, would cease.

The existing cottages at The Heath generate an increasing volume of traffic. At certain times a solid 300 yard line of parked cars along this stretch of road creates a serious driving hazard. If a small area of no more than 20% of land behind these cottages could be designated as parking for existing residents, the danger would be alleviated, while retaining 80% of allotment land.

There should be no consideration of further residential building that would result in overloading the village roads with traffic they cannot accommodate.

See also items 1, 2, and 3 above (in covering letter), The removal of allotment land would buck the national trend and policies that encourage the provision and use of more allotments. The loss of these allotments would be detrimental to the village community.

0920 8 Kings Walden Parish Council

Document Section: Site 51
Representation: *Object*

I write on behalf Kings Walden Parish Council who are strongly objecting to any development on Green Belt Land outside the Boundary agreed in January 2007 and the three parcels of land put forward are all outside this boundary.

The comments made was that the members emphatically stated that there should not be any development outside the envelope as agreed by the Council with Mr Andy Beavan and Mr Richard Kelly in January 2007, my letter to them is enclosed. All three of the suggested sites are outside of this boundary.

The allotments, parcels of land 49 and 51, are well used and I, as Clerk, am constantly being asked how a member of the public can get one, indeed there is a waiting list so it seems when the Government are encouraging us all to be "Greener" that growing ones own would be a much better idea for the environment than building houses, especially as our Parish does not have the facilities or infrastructure to sustain further residents in great numbers.

Breachwood Green has no shopping facilities, nor a doctor, therefore new residents would have to travel for both of these facilities, which does not bring any form of economy to the area but puts more vehicles on the narrow lanes that are always in need of repair. The Bus service is limited.

This brings me to parcel of land no. 50. At the end of some residential houses, one of which has use of the entrance as access to the rear. Some of the residents have made parking provision, others have not thus there are vehicles parked on this narrow lane. Only one vehicle can get by when cars are parked in the lane and then "at a squeeze". The land is positioned on a bend therefore any access to development will be hazardous. It is leased by a local resident from Kings Walden Estate and my Council have noticed that although the Estate have put up the suggestion regarding parcels 49 and 51 they have not included parcel 50, therefore permission of the land owner would need to be sought. Perhaps the case is

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

that they along with my Council did not think the area at all suitable. A lorry ban is imposed on this lane, however, being a farming area, large vehicles used in this industry including recovery vehicles, tractors, etc. use the lane, which provides a further danger for users and residents alike.

The Parish Council has received two letters of objection, which I am enclosing, although you should have received these from the residents personally.

As you will see from the above comments, which I hope you will study the suggested areas will not contribute towards promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well being of the area, and look seriously at letting Breachwood Green, nestling within "Green Belt", continue to be a peaceful rural village.

1466 4 Heath

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

This site is also a well used allotment-holding area. People are being encouraged to grow more food. If this site were to be developed a replacement site for allotment holders would be required.

The village horticultural society is a very active one and for people with insufficient garden space a new site would be a necessity.

General comments relevant to sites 49, 50 and 51 Village of Breachwood Green in the Parish of Kingswalden.

1. Due to the nearness of Luton Airport there is, at many times of the day and night, a great burden of aircraft noise disturbance.
2. The village school has a good record and attracts pupils from a wide area and there is already a full complement of pupils attending.
3. Where country rural sites become available for building there is an apparent trend for the resultant buildings to be large size 'executive' type homes not the modest or affordable homes said to be required and this reveals a flaw in the planning policy.

1696 3 Bretherton

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

sites 49 and 51 Kings Walden

Objections - Both these sites are outside the envelope of the village of Breachwood Green which your planning officer told us (the parishioners of King's Walden) outside of which no development would be permitted. Furthermore they are both allocated allotment holdings which in the current credit crunch are being encouraged by the government to utilise to the full for growing home grown vegetables and produce. This is in addition to them being Greenfield sites classified as grade 3 agricultural land; within groundwater source protection zone 3 and likely to increase commuting and private car use.

1728 4 Beavis

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

This site would also be subject to aircraft noise. Increased traffic might be to some extent be alleviated by an access from Brownings Lane.

1753 5 Williamson

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

The allotment site 49 and 51 are being used by the villages doing their best trying to follow the trend to keep the planet green and grow their own food. This small village does not have many amenities but one of the annual highlights is the horticultural show, which brings many people together to compete with their own home grown produce, an age long tradition in

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Rep No.</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Agent</u>
2848	7	Trustees of Richard Pilkington	Warmingtons

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Support*

As owners of Site 51 we wish to confirm our agreement to the inclusion of this site as one suitable for residential development. Should the site be zoned and planning permission granted the property could be bought forward at an early date for development. The development would lead to a modest expansion of the village of Breachwood Green and being only of relatively small proportions could be developed without the infrastructure constraints which in the current climate can make larger developments unviable and undeliverable.

3135 **4** **Bremner**

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

Breachwood Green is not a suitable location for any further housing development: - the lack of facilities & infrastructure, minimal buses, no employment, associated increase in car usage make any further development most undesirable; in particular:
the main road through the village is already heavily congested with parked cars
the access roads to the village comprise very narrow lanes already struggling to carry the existing traffic load
the local school has little or no spare capacity
there are no medical facilities in the village
there are no shopping facilities within the village
the weaknesses already listed on your website

With particular reference to Site No's 49 and 51, both of which comprise garden allotments, the suggestion to develop these sites for housing is totally contrary to current Government policy and to that of many environmental organisations which seek to encourage the use and expansion of garden allotments, whilst the above developments would do the complete opposite if they were to proceed, as all garden allotment plots in the village would then cease to exist.

3703 **7** **Wood**

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

1 The site does not adjoin the Breachwood Green village boundary in Core Policy C and so does not comply with Core Policy E.

2 The allocation of this site for residential development would provide a precedent for more extensive development of the land enclosed by The Heath, Heath Road, Colemans Road and Brownings Lane. Development on such a scale would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. Development which is limited to the frontage on The Heath might prove acceptable.

3950 **25** **Hertfordshire County
Council - Historic
Environment**

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

Requirement for Pre-application or Pre-determination Archaeological Assessment

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

The sites below have known archaeological remains within them or have archaeological potential. We would therefore wish that - in accordance with Government policy in PPG 16 and the current draft PPS 15 - the LPA requests that pre-application or pre-determination archaeological assessments should be included within all development briefs and other proposals for the sites, if they are formally adopted as development sites in the local development plan. Such assessment would, depending upon the size and location of the proposals, range in scope from additional desk-based research to more extensive archaeological field survey and evaluation. The purpose of the archaeological assessment would be to provide sufficient information about the archaeological resource and in particular the extent of archaeological remains worthy of preservation in situ, to enable the LPA to determine any specific application for development.

**3952 49 Hertfordshire County
Council - Passenger
Transport Unit**

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

Plots 49, 50 & 51: Vehicle access to these plots from the local access roads would be considered acceptable if the access to each plot was located centrally along their frontages taking advantage to maximise the vehicle to vehicle inter visibility. The applicant would have control of the land to each side of the proposed junction this would have to meet the safety requirements of Manual for Streets.

4165 1 Portess

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

There are insufficient facilities in the village of Breachwood Green to support any further growth in this area. For example, there is no shop or post office.

The proposed site (51) is currently divided into allotments used by many members of the village for growing fresh fruit and vegetables and cultivating plants. As someone who rents one of these allotments, I would be strongly opposed to the development as it would significantly reduce the size of my garden and prevent me from growing fresh produce. The cultivation of these allotments is an integral and essential part of village life that would be taken away from us by any development. Many of the allotments (including my own) are rented by owners of the small gardens that border them and consequently a new development would effectively reduce the size of everyone's plot significantly. Any development would also overlook the small gardens we would be left with as well as block out the scenic views we currently have of the rolling countryside. In turn the rural characteristic that attracted people to this area would be ruined as a peaceful village would become more urbanised. Increased noise from residents of any new development would mean that a peaceful and quiet village road would take on the atmosphere of a town housing estate.

The site currently has a designated public right of way which permits countryside walks from The Heath to Brownings Lane and beyond, towards Darley Hall and Tea Green. A development would destroy this facility and again, impact on the idyllic rural environment for which current residents have moved here in the first place.

There is insufficient space for parking for all of the residents of The Heath as it is, with people often having to park 50 yards or more from their house. The problem is exacerbated when visitors also park there at the weekends. The situation has become so bad that overcrowding on The Heath has resulted in numerous instances of wing mirrors being clipped by passing motorists and pedestrians as well as at least one instance of a collision between a motorist and car parked close to site 51's current entrance, whereby the parked car that was hit had to be written off. Consequently any development would result in further overcrowding by parked cars and a much higher risk of accidents.

The Heath cannot support any increase in traffic volume that the development would cause because of both the parking situation (only one side of the road can be used) and the deterioration in the surface of the road. The route commuters take to Luton station/Luton Parkway and the M1 (via Darley Hall or Diamond End) is very windy and narrow and therefore incapable of supporting increased commuter traffic caused by development.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant
4425 **3** **Baker**

Agent

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

With reference to the 3 proposed development sites in Breachwood Green, we would like to register the following comments.

Re-site 50 paddock in Lower Road. Breachwood Green. This site is on a narrow country lane with cars parking on either side of the lane and cars using it as a short cut to Stevenage and Welwyn causing a potential danger to anyone using the lane especially pedestrians. At the present time a number of residents are allowed to use the paddock to park off the lane. There is also a conservations issue as a number of wild animals can be seen in the paddock e.g. fox, deer, moles and rabbits. We want to keep this village a rural green area and to conserve all wild life.

Sites 49 and 51. At present these two sites are well used allotments we know this for sure as we have been waiting for a plot for two and a half years. Central Government wants everyone to be more active and these proposed sites take away that opportunity from the local people. Other problems that we see with all 3 sites are no shop a limited bus service, no doctors surgery, nearest local is in Whitwell, nearest shops are Hitchin and Luton which means more cars using the already busy small lanes.

4426 **2** **Farr**

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Comment*

Considering the government is concerned about the UK not being self-sufficient in food production, building on allotments seems a pretty stupid idea. Breachwood Green does not have the facilities to cope with an influx of people. If housing is to be built in the village IT MUST BE made available to village residents first, at an affordable price, with them given the option to self-build before it is given to a developer.

4726 **1** **Gregson-Williams**

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Object*

My family and I live on the Heath in BWG. We have lived here for 25 years and for 23 of those years we have rented an allotment at the back of our house from Lord Pilkington (A vehement campaigner against the expansion of Luton airport and the destruction of our countryside although clearly happy to ruin this little piece of countryside as long as it lines his pockets.)

Allotments are an integral part of village life, becoming more popular now with the rising cost of living and the move towards organic food. We have kept chickens on ours since we first rented it and grow a substantial amount of veg. There are a number of families from the village, including ours, who spend valuable time working and socialising on their allotments. More houses and more cars are not what we need in Breachwood Green.

4759 **2** **Everett**

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Object*

I cannot believe that anyone would seriously consider building houses on the allotment sites in Breachwood Green. Elsewhere in the country people are queuing up, waiting lists in order to rent an allotment, whilst the Government area urging us to "grow our own". Are the people of Breachwood green to be deprived of the opportunity to do just that? I do not have an allotment of my own but share one with a long standing friend, and between us we grow the whole range of vegetables and fruit. The other allotment holders in the village do the same. Apples provide pies for the whole year, some, together with various jams are distributed to various village organisations for a variety of public sales. In addition to depriving us of the benefits of all this home grown bounty, has anyone stopped to consider what effect additional housing would have on our already crowded roads, that are quite dangerous for local people. It is impossible to walk as drive through the village in absolute safety due to the volume of traffic and the growth of roadside parking. We the inhabitants have tried over the years to maintain a village atmosphere here, and will continue to do so.

4871 **68** **Smith**

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: Object

I object to all sites that alter the Green Belt boundary.

I object to the loss of agricultural land for the following reasons:

Food security is now a national priority;

Open green spaces are a valuable amenity for all;

This country has been in breach of European bio-diversity regulations for the past six years;

A survey of rare and endangered species needs to be undertaken;

Fields are necessary for water management.

4963 3 Greet

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: Object

I object to the use of this site for housing. again, the allotments are well-used and productive. A small percentage of this site could be used to provide off-road parking for the existing cottages at The Heath. Presently the volume of parked vehicles on the road at The Heath often leaves no passing places when passing vehicles meet.

5096 1 Atkinson

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: Object

With regard to the planning proposal on site 51 I make the following objections;

Construction on this site will greatly devalue both my property and that of my neighbours. Residents of Breachwood Green pay more for their properties than the national average. The main reason I moved to this property and village was due to its rural location and surrounding open countryside, and I can safely say that to be true for most of the village residents. Any form of construction on site 51 will change this to its detriment. Potential future purchasers could purchase a similar property at a greatly reduced cost in an urban area. The average price for a terrace property in LU1 3 over the last 2 years is £149,479 where as a similar property in SG4 8 is £217, 390. By increasing the number of properties moves us closer to being an urban area, devaluing our properties.

One of the major appeals to my property is the rural view from both aspects. Looking out of my windows I have views of open countryside. This provides me with a high degree of privacy, which I like. This would change to a view of a small housing estate if NHDC approve site 51 for construction. I will find I have houses with a view directly into my bathroom and bedroom.

An integral part of village life in Breachwood Green is the allotments, where numerous residents spend many hours of recreational time and grow their own produce. This adds to a community cohesion and makes Breachwood Green an appealing place to live. North Herts is a mainly rural district with a mixture of historical market towns and picturesque villages is a direct quote from your website. By building modern properties in this village will effectively ruin this appeal. This is not an area greatly effected by urban spread, nor should it be.

Residential properties will increase road traffic, to the detriment of the residents. Breachwood Green suffers from noise pollution from Luton Airport, however this is compensated by a relatively low level of road traffic. Both the increase in residents and traffic will inevitably reduce the local wildlife population, which include deer, birds of prey and badgers to name a few. This also adds to the appeal of the village.

I am extremely disappointed by the consideration given to build not only on site 51, but in Breachwood Green. There are far more suitable sites in the local area which should be

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

considered. I strongly oppose any planning proposals for this area.

**5138 2 Kings Walden & District
Gardeners Club**

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

The Kings Walden & District Gardeners; Club objects strongly to the proposal of this site for residential development.

These allotments are well used by local residents to provide fresh food for their families. The annual Gardeners' Club Shows would not be viable without entries of produce grown here and these popular events in the village calendar would be no more.

The existing cottages at The HEath generate an unacceptable volume of traffic and parking is hazardous to passing traffic. A relatively small area to the West of the existing cottages could be used to alleviate this parking hazard while retaining 80 % of the allotment area. There should be no consideration of further building that would overload the village roads with traffic they are not designed to accommodate.

Building more houses in this village is not a viable option. It would reduce the standard of social, economic and environmental well being. The village already has a higher proportion of terraced properties and ex council houses in the lower price range than any other village in the vicinity. There is no shop here, a very part-time Post Office, no doctors surgery; the primary School is full, with no possibility of expansion (the school field was taken by North Herts to build council houses).

The taking away of allotment land would buck the national trend and policies which encourage the provision of more allotments. The loss of these allotments would be seriously detrimental to the community.

5225 2 Bell

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

I wish to register my objection to this development proposal. There are a number of reasons why I believe this site is unsuited to any development, especially residential housing. The foremost of these is the proximity of the site to the flight path for Luton airport. Breachwood Green is blighted by aircraft noise from the airport and there was substantial support for opposition of the recent airport expansion plans. This particular site is on the airport side of the village so any houses built on this site would therefore be subject to disturbance from aircraft landing and taking off.

Roads serving the village are narrow and busy at peak times with commuters. Bus services to the nearby towns are infrequent and slow, so therefore are not well supported. Additional housing would be bound to increase private car use and put further pressure on the road network. The village is not well served with amenities with just one pub and no shops. The primary school is over subscribed and struggles to accommodate the resident population. Secondary schools for the village children are in Hitchin and Harpenden. These too are over subscribed and the local children have difficulty in securing admission to their chosen establishments due to the distance we live from these towns.

Another problem with this site is that the land is currently used for by allotments. I suggest that the current move to encourage more home grown produce to reduce the carbon footprint associated with the food miles would be better served by retaining these allotments.

In conclusion, there seem to be more negatives than positives when considering potential development of this site.

5436 3 Cullen

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

I am protesting most strongly against the outline planning proposals for the expansion of residential building within Breachwood Green that will impinge most detrimentally on the village.

I am objecting on the following grounds:

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Community sensitivity

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Scarce amenity

Protection of the Environment

Background

Breachwood Green is a small village approached by four steep roads which are, in places, single track with blind bends. The village is essentially located around four roads; the Heath of which Heath Road and Chapel road are extensions, Oxford Road, Lower Road and Coleman's Road, which leads into Browning's Lane. Considerable residential infilling was carried out in the '60s and '70s and at the same time the creation of St Mary's Rise and Orchard Way.

Area 51: Allotments West of the Heath

This area is a Greenfield site and is also currently used as allotments. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 3. Many of those that use it to grow their own food live in the row of the formerly tied cottages that abut this land. Those old cottages did not have back land and rely on the allotments for growing their own food.

The exit from this site is also highly dangerous being blind in both directions as illustrated below.

Roadside parking in The Heath looking towards the exit from site 51.

Blind exit to the right of site 51.

Restricted view to the left of site 51 showing roadside parking in the Heath

It is again of note that the proposer of this site and site 49 has a derelict brownfield site opposite his residence that he has not proposed.

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Roadside parking in the Heath taken from opposite exit of site 51 showing a vehicle overtaking a long line of parked cars.

Breachwood Green is a quiet rural village but is already suffering from increased traffic congestion. Roadside parking is prevalent not only in Heath Road and Chapel Road but also in Oxford Road. So much so, that in my personal experience, I have narrowly avoided two accidents caused by my line of site being impeded on exiting The Meadows into Oxford Road. Moreover there are an increasing number of 'road rage' incidents caused by the reduction to one lane of the Heath, as illustrated earlier, with cars coming head to head either through impatience or an inability to see oncoming traffic at the end of the line of parked cars. It is now the case that in order to avoid exiting the village by this road my husband and I prefer to use Lower Road even with its obvious narrowness and blind bends, illustrated earlier. In addition there is now roadside parking in Heath Road such that lines of sight are impeded when driving along that road.

Increase in traffic congestion by any one of these proposals would be a nightmare.

More settlements increase in carbon dioxide emissions both through car use and general wastes. It is grossly insulting to be told by the UK Government that we must reduce our output of carbon dioxide at the same time as its quangos are imposing these kinds of increases in emissions by forcing the production of new houses on our countryside.

Reduced parking provision often touted to justify affordable housing or new builds is mistaken because it actually increases traffic congestion since, instead of using off-road provision, inappropriate on road parking is used. I have seen where reduced parking provision for housing development has created dangerous roadside obstructions with parked cars.

Community sensitivity

Whilst lip service may be given to the provision of affordable housing for local people, experience shows that unless rented by the local authority or sold leasehold with caveats that only local people can be housed, such housing will inevitably be sold on at market prices. Moreover as far as I am aware there has never been a definition of who qualifies as local and if there is not enough local uptake then clearly the housing will be made available to incomers and the whole justification for building such houses will be betrayed.

The local village community is made up of those whose roots lie in rural communities and those who are in voluntary exile from the urban and suburban rat race. There appears to be no concern over our community's sensitivity to the rural landscape and enjoyment of our homes as required by the Human Rights Act (Articles 8 and 14). In a multicultural democracy equal weight should be given to the needs of rural culture and the sensitivities of the rural community as to any other community.

Over the last 20 years we have seen and resisted a growing pincer movement against our community. There is the current proposed East of Luton expansion, the West of Stevenage expansion, which was successfully opposed only to be imposed by the then MP for Hull East and Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, and the proposed huge expansion of Luton Airport which would have completely destroyed acres of farmland and access from my village to the south.

We now find that there is another proposed expansion from Luton Airport for commercial premises over existing farmland almost to the borders of my home village and finally proposals

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

to squeeze more building into our village. This country is of finite size and cannot continue to support the concreting over of productive and soak land. Moreover we are continually told that we have either reached or will soon reach peak oil. If that is the case, shipment by road, air and sea will become prohibitively expensive and we will have to rely far more, or even exclusively, on locally grown produce. How will that be achieved if our productive land has been swallowed up?

More and more children have no concept of where their food is grown or raised; indeed if it does not come out of a plastic wrapper they are liable to refuse to eat it. A report on the radio only recently indicated that when children were encouraged to grow their own food they were far more amenable to 'eating their greens'. Further building over productive land will distance more and more of our children from appreciating where food comes from and the vital necessity of keeping productive land free of urban development.

Scarce amenity

Allotments are becoming a scarce amenity. The UK's first food security assessment was launched this year by the Government's Department of Food and rural affairs (DEFRA) as part of a package of material on the future of our food system. The material discusses issues ranging from how we can create a sustainable food system locally and globally. It is thus hypocritical to demand that more and more land capable of feeding us is destroyed.

Ironically National Allotment Week took place during this consultation period. This was a week to promote the awareness and availability of allotments both locally and nationally and to show the public and the local authorities the strength of support and interest for the heritage of allotment culture. It was also to promote the social benefits of allotment gardening, which include benefits to health, education and community well-being.

Protection of the Environment

Villages, such as Breachwood Green, and the landscape in which they are situated are unique to the English countryside. Destruction of these landscapes is a desecration of the heritage, character and tradition of England. Just as we accept that buildings of unique historical and architectural beauty and interest should be preserved and conserved so also must the historical landscapes of our country be treated.

The relentless destruction of our natural environment with the creation and spread of settlements caused by an unnatural increase in population pressure, encouraged by politicians, leads to the depletion of our natural resources. As a result our productive land is invaded and degraded. It should be noted that not only is England the most densely populated country in Europe but also as densely populated as Bangladesh.

Moreover, the natural aspiration of people to own cars will increase carbon emissions. Tragically the proposed development will contribute to the destruction of the natural environment, which acts as an organic sink for carbon through the photosynthesis carried out by green plant chlorophyll.

It must never be forgotten that building such as is proposed can and will never be reversed. When the land is gone it is gone for ever.

It is also blindingly obvious that run-off from the hard surfaces created by building not only causes flooding, by rainwater flowing into river systems that cannot cope with it, but also, thereby, reduces the transport of water through the natural soil, rock and subsurface to replenish natural aquifers. Thus development not only increases flooding but reduces the water table and available ground water. Only in December 2008 the Environment Agency published a report which stated that East Anglia is already considered to be an area of great water stress and that many lakes, estuaries and rivers are drained so quickly that there is a danger to wildlife and that there is already less water available per head in this part of England than those living in Egypt and Morocco. The report says the pressure is greatest in the South East and Eastern England, the driest and most crowded parts of England and Wales.

Summary

If planning permission is given for these sites in Breachwood Green then not only will the already unacceptable congestion in the village become insupportable but also such additional housing will contribute to an increase in local pollution by creating rubbish and sewerage, and through the natural aspiration of people to own cars, increased carbon emissions. Building over agricultural and natural land will also destroy wildlife habitats.

We have a moral and spiritual duty to protect and preserve our natural heritage and to leave a light footprint for future generations who must live in this land. Our natural heritage is also our cultural heritage. Clearly the permanent destruction of food land and soak land will have an ongoing detrimental effect on those who live here both now and in the future.

In addition England's unique countryside with its villages is also a world renowned tourist attraction. I have had visitors who were in awe of the beauty and peacefulness of our local countryside.

It is noteworthy that those who have proposed these sites do not themselves stand to be adversely affected in the enjoyment of their homes.

5566 1 Bignell

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: Object

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

to whom it may concern.

i would like to object in the strongest terms to the proposed change of use to our allotments.

i have been working my allotment for the last 7 years and the benefit to me is immense. apart from the relaxing and theraputic effect i can grow my own crop without the current pesticides used by the farmers, saving me not only cost in pounds but to my health as well.

the environmental impact of these proposed changes to our already stretched village resources would be very damaging.

in a local survey the wait for allotments now is considerable so i do not want to give up my allotment to have to wait years for a replacement, probably miles from where i live.

to introduce more houses without improving the local resources ie there is no village shop , the local school is over subscribed, the water pressure is barely adequate, roads poorly maintained and lack of off road parking making "the heath" a very dangerous road after 18.00 when everybody returns home from work.

i am sure there are plenty of brown field sites in the surrounding towns in north herts that would make a better choice for development thus keeping traffic off the roads

6066 3 Burkitt

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Object*

1. To destroy our farmland and woodland is short-sighted. We will need to be more self sufficiency in the future. Our agricultural land is precious for crops, livestock & sustainable woodland.
2. Allotment land is very necessary, especially in villages where a lot of people only have small gardens. Everything should be done to retain and promote allotments now and in the future.
3. Damage to wildlife by building is significant, not only by loss of habitat but by altering the water table which affects both wildlife and existing buildings, added to which our village infrastructure could not cope with more people.
4. Our school can only just accommodate our children. More people will cause major problems; we would inevitably have the situation where some of our village children would not get places at their own village school!
5. Parking is already at dangerous levels in the school road at delivery and pick-up times. Other village roads are becoming hazardous due to on-road parking.
6. Our ancient village deserves to be kept as a village with local fields kept for agriculture and allotments.

6323 1 Dunne

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Object*

am writing to strongly object to the proposed building on site 51 - allotments west of the Heath. I feel without a doubt Breachwood Green does not have the infrastructure to accommodate more housing within this small village. Plus many people rely on the allotments for there fruit and vegetables, I myself have just managed to secure a much needed allotment on the site which will again be used to feed my family and give my children the experience of growing produce for themselves. If housing was to go ahead it truly would spoil a beautiful part of North Herts.

6325 3 Cullen

Document Section:Site 51

Representation: *Object*

As a villager and not a NIMBY I am inclined to contact you to ask where on earth the idea for these proposals came from?

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

The three proposals will without doubt massively increase traffic density in roads that are not capable of taking it and place a huge strain on available roads, services and open spaces.

Site 49 will simply ensure a whole load of traffic uses a single track road to access Luton instead of the main road through the village.

The Lower Road proposal (site 50) is entirely ludicrous in that it is in one of the narrowest most congested lanes in the village on a blind bend!

Site 51 (if any are feasible then this more than the others) but will increase massively the traffic on a road already with wall to wall car parking effectively making it a single track road!

The traffic congestion will be horrendous so they will all use Colemans Lane (see site 49)

The verges are already decimated with Stopsley people cutting through so as to miss the congestion in Luton so what on earth is going to happen when even more local traffic joins it?

What type of housing is proposed? Will the school cope? Will the infrastructure cope? Will the inadequate roads cope? Will the environment cope? Will the utilities cope?

I will object very strongly (along with the whole village) if these proposals gain any credence.

The mix of housing in the village is about right with starter homes through to fine detached residences. There has been no wholesale building in this Green Belt area for many years as it is a naturally evolving village in a beautiful part of the world and is relatively unaffected by crass, ill thought out development and although you state that there is no environmental issue or wildlife issue you are wrong!

The extraction from the Mimram is already severe and you now want to add 50 - 100 households to this area - madness, how does it all add up?

The Bedfordshire expansion threatens the Lilley Bottom Road valley as you are all too weak willed to stand up to them and tell them to bugger off our county and then have the nerve to

ask us to accommodate social mixed housing (for I bet that's what it will be) when the current Luton infrastructure and access to the M1 is already inadequate. Social mixed housing will

alter the natural demographic nature of the village and will not necessarily add villagers with respect for the country, property and their fellow villagers!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Why not develop around Stevenage for God's sake, it's got land a plenty around it and the A1 running through it!!!

Note that if it is fact that a local villager, a Mr Roger Wood, proposed site 50 then be aware that no-one in this village was consulted by him, no one locally was consulted by him so I do not understand where his interests lie or his reasons for springing this on us! We will undoubtedly be discussing this with him!

6342 3 Titmuss and Rookwood

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: Object

We would like to object to the potential development on Sites 49, 50 and 51 all of which are in Breachwood Green where we live.

Breachwood Green does not have the facilities to accommodate more houses/residents, the small village school and pre-school are already full and if more residents were in the village it would eventually mean that local children would not be able to get into their own village school.

We already have to live with the noise of Luton Airport and the huge amount of traffic that bypasses through the village between Luton and Hitchin, if development took place in

Breachwood Green this would mean an increase in the traffic, noise and pollution on our village.

Development would have a negative effect on our countryside, wild animals/birds and plants which are all peacefully living in our village. Many residents' home gardens are so small that they rely on the allotments for fresh fruit/vegetables and also relaxation, therefore to build on them would be a huge shame for all.

All of our agricultural land is very precious to everyone and is imperative for future self-sufficiency. To develop on it seems very short-sighted, we should be preserving this land not building on it.

The current parking facilities in Breachwood Green are very limited. On The Heath there is already nose-to-tail parking on one side resulting in the road being 'one-way' traffic. If development were to take place this would mean more cars and more residents and would increase the chances of somebody being injured.

6347 3 Bowles

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: Object

Area 51: Allotments West of the Heath

This area is a Greenfield site and is also currently used as allotments. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 3. Many of those that use it to grow their own food live in the row of the formerly tied cottages that abut this land. Those old cottages did not have back land and rely on the allotments for growing their own food.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant Agent

The exit from this site is also highly dangerous being blind in both directions as illustrated below.

Roadside parking in The Heath looking towards the exit from site 51.

Blind exit to the right of site 51.

Restricted view to the left of site 51 showing roadside parking in the Heath

It is again of note that the proposer of this site and site 49 has a derelict brownfield site opposite his residence that he has not proposed.

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Roadside parking in the Heath taken from opposite exit of site 51 showing a vehicle overtaking a long line of parked cars.

Breachwood Green is a quiet rural village but is already suffering from increased traffic congestion. Roadside parking is prevalent not only in Heath Road and Chapel Road but also in Oxford Road. So much so, that in my personal experience, I have narrowly avoided two accidents caused by my line of site being impeded on exiting The Meadows into Oxford Road.

Moreover there are an increasing number of 'road rage' incidents caused by the reduction to one lane of the Heath, as illustrated earlier, with cars coming head to head either through impatience or an inability to see oncoming traffic at the end of the line of parked cars. It is now the case that in order to avoid exiting the village by this road my husband and I prefer to use Lower Road even with its obvious narrowness and blind bends, illustrated earlier. In addition there is now roadside parking in Heath Road such that lines of sight are impeded when driving along that road.

Increase in traffic congestion by any one of these proposals would be a nightmare.

More settlements increase in carbon dioxide emissions both through car use and general wastes. It is grossly insulting to be told by the UK Government that we must reduce our output of carbon dioxide at the same time as its quangos are imposing these kinds of increases in emissions by forcing the production of new houses on our countryside.

Reduced parking provision often touted to justify affordable housing or new builds is mistaken because it actually increases traffic congestion since, instead of using off-road provision, inappropriate on road parking is used. I have seen where reduced parking provision for housing development has created dangerous roadside obstructions with parked cars.

Community sensitivity

Whilst lip service may be given to the provision of affordable housing for local people, experience shows that unless rented by the local authority or sold leasehold with caveats that only local people can be housed, such housing will inevitably be sold on at market prices. Moreover as far as I am aware there has never been a definition of who qualifies as local and if there is not enough local uptake then clearly the housing will be made available to incomers and the whole justification for building such houses will be betrayed.

The local village community is made up of those whose roots lie in rural communities and those who are in voluntary exile from the urban and suburban rat race. There appears to be no concern over our community's sensitivity to the rural landscape and enjoyment of our homes as required by the Human Rights Act (Articles 8 and 14). In a multicultural democracy equal weight should be given to the needs of rural culture and the sensitivities of the rural community as to any other community.

Over the last 20 years we have seen and resisted a growing pincer movement against our community. There is the current proposed East of Luton expansion, the West of Stevenage expansion, which was successfully opposed only to be imposed by the then MP for Hull East and Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, and the proposed huge expansion of Luton Airport which would have completely destroyed acres of farmland and access from my village to the south.

We now find that there is another proposed expansion from Luton Airport for commercial premises over existing farmland almost to the borders of my home village and finally proposals to squeeze more building into our village. This country is of finite size and cannot continue to support the concreting over of productive and soak land. Moreover we are continually told that we have either reached or will soon reach peak oil. If that is the case, shipment by road, air and sea will become prohibitively expensive and we will have to rely far more, or even exclusively, on locally grown produce. How will that be achieved if our productive land has been swallowed up?

More and more children have no concept of where their food is grown or raised; indeed if it does not come out of a plastic wrapper they are liable to refuse to eat it. A report on the radio only recently indicated that when children were encouraged to grow their own food they were far more amenable to 'eating their greens'. Further building over productive land will distance more and more of our children from appreciating where food comes from and the vital necessity of keeping productive land free of urban development.

Scarce amenity

Allotments are becoming a scarce amenity. The UK's first food security assessment was launched this year by the Government's Department of Food and rural affairs (DEFRA) as part of a package of material on the future of our food system. The material discusses issues ranging from how we can create a sustainable food system locally and globally. It is thus hypocritical to demand that more and more land capable of feeding us is destroyed.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

Ironically National Allotment Week took place during this consultation period. This was a week to promote the awareness and availability of allotments both locally and nationally and to show the public and the local authorities the strength of support and interest for the heritage of allotment culture. It was also to promote the social benefits of allotment gardening, which include benefits to health, education and community well-being.

Protection of the Environment

Villages, such as Breachwood Green, and the landscape in which they are situated are unique to the English countryside. Destruction of these landscapes is a desecration of the heritage, character and tradition of England. Just as we accept that buildings of unique historical and architectural beauty and interest should be preserved and conserved so also must the historical landscapes of our country be treated.

The relentless destruction of our natural environment with the creation and spread of settlements caused by an unnatural increase in population pressure, encouraged by politicians, leads to the depletion of our natural resources. As a result our productive land is invaded and degraded. It should be noted that not only is England the most densely populated country in Europe but also as densely populated as Bangladesh.

Moreover, the natural aspiration of people to own cars will increase carbon emissions. Tragically the proposed development will contribute to the destruction of the natural environment, which acts as an organic sink for carbon through the photosynthesis carried out by green plant chlorophyll.

It must never be forgotten that building such as is proposed can and will never be reversed. When the land is gone it is gone for ever.

It is also blindingly obvious that run-off from the hard surfaces created by building not only causes flooding, by rainwater flowing into river systems that cannot cope with it, but also, thereby, reduces the transport of water through the natural soil, rock and subsurface to replenish natural aquifers. Thus development not only increases flooding but reduces the water table and available ground water. Only in December 2008 the Environment Agency published a report which stated that East Anglia is already considered to be an area of great water stress and that many lakes, estuaries and rivers are drained so quickly that there is a danger to wildlife and that there is already less water available per head in this part of England than those living in Egypt and Morocco. The report says the pressure is greatest in the South East and Eastern England, the driest and most crowded parts of England and Wales.

Summary

If planning permission is given for these sites in Breachwood Green then not only will the already unacceptable congestion in the village become insupportable but also such additional housing will contribute to an increase in local pollution by creating rubbish and sewerage, and through the natural aspiration of people to own cars, increased carbon emissions. Building over agricultural and natural land will also destroy wildlife habitats.

We have a moral and spiritual duty to protect and preserve our natural heritage and to leave a light footprint for future generations who must live in this land. Our natural heritage is also our cultural heritage. Clearly the permanent destruction of food land and soak land will have an ongoing detrimental effect on those who live here both now and in the future.

In addition England's unique countryside with its villages is also a world renowned tourist attraction. I have had visitors who were in awe of the beauty and peacefulness of our local countryside.

It is noteworthy that those who have proposed these sites do not themselves stand to be adversely affected in the enjoyment of their homes.

"Never give in, never give in, never, never, never, never; in nothing, great or small, large or petty; never give in except to convictions of honour and good sense. Never yield to force; never yield to the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy."

Churchill; Harrow School, 29 October 1941.

6357 2 Rochford and Fossey

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

I will treat these on the same basis. They are both allotment sites but site 49 also includes an adjacent tract of land. I strongly object to both of these sites being offered for future residential development.

This proposal is outrageous when it will deprive the village of a valuable amenity, in particular for the elderly whose hobby and interest will be taken away, not to mention the loss of food that they grow for themselves and others. Any notion that alternative land will be provided by The Estate for allotments is not an option when you consider that the current allotment users have put time, effort and money into the existing plots and have achieved a quality of cultivation that will take years to attain on a new site.

Added to that, the government has just published a white paper on self sufficiency for food production in the UK which highlights the use of allotments and land sharing to make a valuable contribution to our food sourcing without resort to importing. This includes the fact that home production of food will cut down on transport and helps with carbon emission

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant
targets to be met.

Agent

At the moment there is a waiting list for allotments in the UK which is increasing. Home food production popularity is rising and yet, this proposal from King's Walden Estate wants to ignore that and take away this from people who enjoy their pastime and benefit the economy and the environment. Scandalous!

But, in addition to these facts, the possible development of these two sites raises other issues.

Increased traffic from new residents, their visitors and trade vehicles on narrow rural roads already burdened by increased usage from 'rat running' at peak times and from the use of satellite navigation by people would never venture onto such roads in the past.

Both sites are very close to the Luton Airport flight path and make them less attractive for potential purchasers. Additional people would now be at risk from possible air accidents and from the pollution from aircraft emissions.

6391 4 Davies

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

Area 51: Allotments West of the Heath

This area is a Greenfield site and is also currently used as allotments. It is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and is located within groundwater protection zone 3. Many of those that use it to grow their own food live in the row of the formerly tied cottages that abut this land. Those old cottages did not have back land and rely on the allotments for growing their own food.

The exit from this site is also highly dangerous being blind in both directions as illustrated below.

Roadside parking in The Heath looking towards the exit from site 51.

Blind exit to the right of site 51.

Restricted view to the left of site 51 showing roadside parking in the Heath

It is again of note that the proposer of this site and site 49 has a derelict brownfield site opposite his residence that he has not proposed.

Increase in traffic/Disruption of local traffic/loading of traffic onto rural roads

Road congestion within the village

Roadside parking in the Heath taken from opposite exit of site 51 showing a vehicle overtaking a long line of parked cars.

Breachwood Green is a quiet rural village but is already suffering from increased traffic congestion. Roadside parking is prevalent not only in Heath Road and Chapel Road but also in Oxford Road. So much so, that in my personal experience, I have narrowly avoided two accidents caused by my line of site being impeded on exiting The Meadows into Oxford Road.

Moreover there are an increasing number of 'road rage' incidents caused by the reduction to one lane of the Heath, as illustrated earlier, with cars coming head to head either through impatience or an inability to see oncoming traffic at the end of the line of parked cars. It is now the case that in order to avoid exiting the village by this road my husband and I prefer to use Lower Road even with its obvious narrowness and blind bends, illustrated earlier. In addition there is now roadside parking in Heath Road such that lines of sight are impeded when driving along that road.

Increase in traffic congestion by any one of these proposals would be a nightmare.

More settlements increase in carbon dioxide emissions both through car use and general wastes. It is grossly insulting to be told by the UK Government that we must reduce our output of carbon dioxide at the same time as its quangos are imposing these kinds of increases in emissions by forcing the production of new houses on our countryside.

Reduced parking provision often touted to justify affordable housing or new builds is mistaken because it actually increases traffic congestion since, instead of using off-road provision, inappropriate on road parking is used. I have seen where reduced parking provision for housing development has created dangerous roadside obstructions with parked cars.

6401 3 Burkitt

Document Section: Site 51

Representation: *Object*

These three proposed sites are within the village of Breachwood Green, building houses on any of them would further degrade the quality of village life.

Representation for Land Allocations: Additional Suggested Sites July 2009



Site 51

Ref. Rep No. Applicant

Agent

1. The village infrastructure is already overloaded, in particular The Heath and Heath Road are now virtually one way roads because of continuous car parking. Additional housing would further increase this congestion.
2. The village school in Oxford Road is already full, I understand that some village children were only admitted on appeal last year. There is no room for further expansion and again Oxford Road would be unable to cope with the additional congestion that further expansion would cause.
3. The UK needs more, not less farmland and allotments. Each of these three proposed sites is valuable and its removal would be a great loss to our village.