

Cookies on appeal a planning decision service

We use some essential cookies to make this service work.

We'd also like to use analytics cookies so we can understand how you use the service and make improvements.

[View cookies \(/cookies\)](/cookies)



Appeal a planning decision

Appeal 6004972

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Inquiry
Appeal site	Land To North Of Little Green Lane, Croxley Green, WD3 3SP
Applicant	Owen Weaver
Local planning authority	Three Rivers
Application number	24/2073/OUT

Interested party 1

Comments	The area is an area of Ancient woodland served by very narrow lanes and tracks. To build on said area would damage the woodland, cause traffic chaos and cause huge environmental issues with excess noise, traffic fumes, damage to the exisiting laneways and overloading of the current highways structure. The upheaval to the local current infrastructure would be immense for the years this takes place. Read more
----------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 2

Comments	600 residential dwellings will overcrowd an already overpopulated area where the infrastructure is currently struggling. (S106 of the Town and Country planning act 1990): There will be strain on the connecting narrow roads. Before the site is even completed damage will be done; I have witnessed the construction lorries entering and exiting a similar construction site near Hemel Hempstead; the damage to the road system locally is there for all to see. Our already poorly maintained roads will not be able to withstand such traffic. I have seen no evidence to suggest that Richborough will repair the damage the site
----------	--

traffic will cause.

Access to current primary and secondary schools will be limited by the extra traffic entering and exiting the new development (2 cars per household = 1200 extra cars), particularly at drop off and pick up times. Surely this is a danger to our future generations as no traffic management system exists or is proposed.

The wild life and fresh air we enjoy currently on the Green Belt site and ancient woodlands will be destroyed.

There will be an increase in noise pollution.

Nature needs someone to defend it!

Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD etc were created for a reason, this proposed development ignores everything put in place to protect our heritage. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 3

Comments

Added as a document

Supporting documents

[Margaret Allum.pdf \(/published-document/63ce4f2e-c1f9-4736-9241-844317fcb81d\)](#)

Interested party 4

Comments

The appeal should not overturn the decision made by the District Council.

- The proposed development is clearly on Green Belt land. This land has not been previously developed, and strongly supports key purposes of Green Belt designation (notably to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

-The development would undoubtedly result in the deterioration of Ancient Woodland within and adjacent to the site.

- The development has not secured necessary enhancements to infrastructure.

Further, the traffic on Baldwins Lane, Links Way and Durrants Drive has increased substantially during recent gas and water works, materially increasing travel time to school and work. These works are relatively small in comparison to the proposed development. The impact on local residents of a multi-year development increasing traffic in the area has not been adequately considered in the planning application. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 5

Comments

The appeal should not overturn the decision made by the District Council.

- The proposed development is clearly on Green Belt land. This land has not been previously developed, and strongly supports key purposes of Green Belt designation (notably to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

-The development would undoubtedly result in the deterioration of Ancient Woodland within and adjacent to the site.

- The development has not secured necessary enhancements to infrastructure.

Further, the traffic on Baldwins Lane, Links Way and Durrants Drive has increased substantially during recent gas and water works, materially increasing travel time to school and work. These works are relatively small in comparison to the proposed development. The impact on local residents of a multi-year development increasing traffic in the area has not been adequately considered in the planning application. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 6

Comments

Added as a document

Supporting documents

[Thames Water.msg \(/published-document/45787508-029f-4d17-bdd5-682fe07b22d5\)](#)

Interested party 7

Comments

1. Green Belt & Environmental Impact

- The proposed development is on Green Belt land, which should only be developed in exceptional circumstances. The applicant must demonstrate why this development is necessary and cannot be located elsewhere.

- The site provides valuable wildlife habitats and supports biodiversity, including protected species such as bats, badgers, and birds. There is concern that the Environmental Impact Assessment does not fully address these risks.

- The development will require the removal of hedgerows and trees, which form an important ecological corridor. The loss of mature trees for pedestrian/cycle routes could negatively impact biodiversity.

- Removal of established highway trees to accommodate the cycle path.

- Potential increased flood risk in the area, particularly affecting

Rousebarn Lane and Links Way.

2. Overdevelopment & Infrastructure Strain - The scale and density of the proposal do not align with the existing character of Croxley Green, which consists of lower-density housing.

- Local infrastructure (GP surgeries, schools, roads, and public transport) is already under pressure. Additional housing will exacerbate these issues.

3. Traffic & Road Safety

- Insufficient road capacity to accommodate additional vehicle movements.
- Impact on existing road network with no clear mitigation plan.
- Increased traffic on Little Green Lane, Links Way, and surrounding roads will worsen congestion and pose a risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and school children.
- The cycle path proposal along Links Way raises concerns over safety and practicality, especially where it intersects with residential driveways and existing pedestrian crossings.
- The entrance to the development may create a bottleneck effect, particularly at peak school times for Little Green Junior School and Croxley Danes School

Comments:

4. Lack of Sustainable & Affordable Housing

- Unclear commitment to delivering genuinely affordable housing for local people.
- The development does not prioritise sustainable building practices or renewable energy integration.

5. Local Planning Policy & Housing Supply

- Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, making Green Belt land more vulnerable to speculative development.
- The 2015 Local Plan is still in effect and seeks to protect Green Belt land and prevent urban sprawl.
- The application does not fully align with TRDC's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.

6. Flood Risk and Drainage Issues

- Parts of the site experience surface water flooding, which could be exacerbated by new development.
- No clear plan is in place for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to manage excess water, and there is concern over potential flood risk to existing homes.

7. Character and Scale of Development

- The proposed housing density is out of character with the surrounding area, which consists mainly of lower-density residential housing.
- Concerns have been raised that the development may set a precedent for further Green Belt erosion, leading to additional speculative applications. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 8

Comments	Added as a document
----------	---------------------

Interested party 9

Comments	I do not support the appeal and support the reasons given by Three Rivers District Council when refusing planning permission.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 10

Comments	I strongly object to this development. I stand by my original objections and would like to add the following. The planning committee made a pragmatic and excellent decision when refusing this plan. All the reasons they quoted were excellent. There is not the infrastructure to cope with this many new properties taking into account other developments in the area. Watford General Hospital is at near braking point with its current load and the re-development of this has been further delayed. The Ambulance service has been rated as one of the worst in the country due to the over population. Hertfordshire Constabulary have one of the tightest budgets of all the police forces in the country and would also be further stretched beyond its means. The waste collection have commented that they would need a new facility to cope with the extra waste collection that is required. This is when the government are making waste collection more targeted and imposing stricter rules. These are but a few areas highlighting that this development should not be granted. The roads in the area are not fit for the extra 1000+ cars that could be travelling on them. There are constant traffic jams every day of the week due to the volume of people. This is GREEN BELT land. It is next to ancient woodland and within that woodland is an SSSI. This is not just a wood, it is an area of SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST. The development of this estate would dramatically alter the ecosystem and affect the wildlife of the area. It is well known that we need wildlife to continue living, so why would destroying it even be considered. I do not believe that there is anything that the developer can put in place to prevent the harm that they would irreversibly cause. People need woodland and green spaces to promote good mental health. I suggest that you walk around this area and then explain how building anything would actually make it better. The Government doesn't have the right to blindly grant building
----------	---

developments. Each one needs to be considered on an individual basis. There are so many other non green belt sites that can be developed, don't take away the green space.

The plan proposed is not fit for purpose. It would very much appear that the developer is only looking to make money and certainly doesn't care about designated green belt land.

I don't think that this area should ever be developed, but it should definitely not be considered when the surrounding infrastructure is on it's knees.

The appeal committee should do the right thing and deny this development. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 11

Comments	Added as a document
----------	---------------------

Supporting documents	Mr P Tett.pdf (/published-document/a220e6be-42c4-4d3c-82d1-6c99ac5c891d)
----------------------	--

Interested party 12

Comments	The proposed development will cause too much damage to the area abundant with wildlife and nature. The infrastructure for the roads and transport is not adequate for a development this size. We should not be developing on our precious Green Belt. Read more
----------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 13

Comments	I further add to the objections submitted previously by identifying a key component of the entire application that doesn't get the attention it requires. I'm hoping that the Planning Inspectorate on this occasion gives due consideration to the position of the existing residents.
----------	--

Existing residents that will have to endure years of disruption with construction traffic navigating residential roads to reach the proposed site. In the view of Hertfordshire Highways, this level of disruption is acceptable, as gathered from their statements at a TRDC planning meeting (where the proposed development was thrown out).

Similarly, TRDC planning committee have the view that, at a stretch, the land in question could be considered 'grey belt, and that any objections should be reviewed in context of the "wider social benefit". But hold on, there's a social benefit in not proceeding with the

development, that being respecting the residents that have raised their objections, enjoy the open space, do not want their environment eroded, wish to see less cars on our roads and protection of the existing infrastructure. On that last point, we have already seen the consequent of over development in the area with the roads at the North end of the village being dug up to address draining issues at the Killingdown Farm development.

And of course, sustainability. Are we now ignoring this? The brochure I've seen from Richborough refers to this very point, with guarantees of planting so many trees and ensuring this amount of open space to be preserved; all the usual. However, none of that offsets the damage done to the environment in the first place. And I question how they would be held accountable. If they fail to meet their stated targets, so what? The houses will be built, and, at worst, they (the developers) may face a fine (minor in comparison to the financial yield of the development).

So, do the right thing by the local community and, for once, respect the view and position of the incumbent [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 14

Comments

Please see attached the Appeal Statement submitted on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council.

Kind regards

Supporting documents

[Appendix 14 - HCC SEND Special School Place Planning Strategy - 2020.pdf \(/published-document/f08fff7f-1f63-48a1-b8e3-3bace5235a00\)](#)
[Appendix 4 - DfE Scorecard cost - per pupil place - 2024.pdf \(/published-document/b9bd0de4-0ba4-4926-8513-415afee9af54\)](#)
[Appendix 2 - Guide to Developer Infrastructure Contributions Legal Pack.pdf \(/published-document/9b72bb94-1a40-4cfa-981b-418b0a0b6ee6\)](#)
[Appendix 11 - Officers Report for 24_2073_OUT.pdf \(/published-document/13e99da2-0f80-4083-b03a-4d62c06710d4\)](#)
[Appendix 7 - Guide to the Hertfordshire Demographic Model.pdf \(/published-document/12684459-4767-45b8-8393-57f20dc12fdd\)](#)
[Appendix 13 - Technical Appendix 3 - Education \(Mainstream Schools\).pdf \(/published-document/7f25b2d6-aa56-40f0-b373-69a77d1d3dfc\)](#)
[Appendix 12 - Technical Appendix 11 - Land Matters.pdf \(/published-document/5f1ed343-ae19-4bb0-b67f-7d52f65e1991\)](#)
[Appendix 20 - South West Herts LHNA Update.pdf \(/published-document/ac818b10-8e71-42cd-ac0f-7db0f4cf0c81\)](#)
[Appendix 15 - Technical Appendix 4 - Education \(Special Schools and Specialist Provision\).pdf \(/published-document/dc08548e-719b-4caa-b2b7-8b4e83537dd1\)](#)
[Appendix 1 - Guide to Developer Infrastructure Contributions 2024.pdf \(/published-document/aef80d35-6eed-49db-a8fc-8e944d81a9c3\)](#)
[Appendix 19 - Technical Appendix 8 - Fire & Rescue.pdf \(/published-document/9f0bbfc5-332a-4323-8254-907dcca50a03\)](#)
[Appendix 9 - Appeal Decision - Land east of A10, Buntingford,](#)

[Hertfordshire.pdf \(/published-document/9e71a55a-b667-4d55-94db-90c93aeeca9a\)](#)

[Appendix 5 - DfE Securing developer contributions for education - Aug 2023.pdf \(/published-document/d7f330cd-2c76-4353-9599-a85249ce9d38\)](#)

[Appendix 18 - Technical Appendix 7 - Waste Management.pdf \(/published-document/eda26488-dc7d-4006-b5dd-af23b4aa49b9\)](#)

[HCC Appeal Statement - Little Green Lane.pdf \(/published-document/49802706-1799-44c6-925e-b1fa281484d5\)](#)

[Appendix 17 - Collected Waste Spatial Strategy.pdf \(/published-document/95a1b1fc-5ecb-4422-80ea-c26473c5ea7d\)](#)

[Appendix 10 - HCC Response to 24_2073_OUT - Nov 2025.pdf \(/published-document/f87547b3-a171-4a41-a044-dc12085b3d77\)](#)

[Appendix 3 - Guide to Non Education Model and Indicative Section 106 Contributions Calculator.pdf \(/published-document/98bdf79f-fa6b-43f1-a70a-eeec6309e10e\)](#)

[Appendix 21 - Technical Appendix 10 - Children's Homes.pdf \(/published-document/84e71cd9-3157-4703-9534-f1bbf31249ce\)](#)

[Appendix 16 - Technical Appendix 2 - Education \(Early Years\).pdf \(/published-document/0888c4d0-199f-44c4-8472-f6d093fb998c\)](#)

[Appendix 8 - Pupil Yield Survey Methodology.pdf \(/published-document/75d07d25-2c0e-46f2-bf27-f8a885243171\)](#)

[Appendix 6 - DfE - Estimating Pupil Yield from Housing Development.pdf \(/published-document/aba0a57d-af48-4261-82b3-fefa683b28c5\)](#)
