

Informal Meeting Notes: 22nd May 2021 – 2.30pm

Netherfield Lane Field

In Attendance:

Julia Davies (SAPC & NP Steering) Mike Dorman (SAPC & NP Steering) Sarah Chapman (SAPC & NP Steering) Paul Stretch (SAPC – Observer, not a participant) Clare Maynard (SMPC & Steering)	25 Residents were in attendance
---	---------------------------------

Purpose of the Meeting: To listen to the views of the Netherfield Lane Residents regarding the Websters Proposals

- Mrs R. asked for the meeting to be recorded. It was advised that notes would be taken for the informal discussion, but we would not be filming/recording, as we do for our more formal neighbourhood planning formal meetings. Mr & Mrs R. asked whether they were able to record this via their mobile. The group were asked if there were any objections and there were none.
- A resident commented that they did not want building on the field but had been told that if there was no neighbourhood plan that they would still have a say, is this correct? The resident declined to comment who had told them this. We advised that no neighbourhood plan meant that there was less protection from developers and EHDC could potentially look for more dwelling numbers. A plan enables protection not just from the number of dwellings but design of new builds, protected views and community assets etc. Julia Davies gave a brief overview of how the neighbourhood plan came about following a meeting with the then County Councillor & EHDC who strongly advised that one was created. The problem was that we are covered by a lot of green belt and flood zone 3 so we were very restricted on potential sites within the neighbourhood plan boundary.
- It was made clear that the Brownfield Site (Websters units) is actually in the Greenbelt and by not including the field will make it very vulnerable in the future if it's not brought into the plan, as it will be surrounded by homes. Three years ago, the Websters planning application was turned down due to no employment opportunities and therefore their revised plans had to include units. This is why no more housing could fit onto the brownfield site.
- Would putting trees on the field stop building? This would not stop development unfortunately.
- It was noted that Mr Webster Senior loved the field and would not have wanted anything to be built on it. Also, that Mr Fuselli told the residents that he would not build on the field. This would be raised with Mr Fuselli for further comment. **(Action)**
- The plan was reviewed and there is concern over the entrance opposite the garages. If turning this into a cul de sac, it would omit two homes and there would be a loss of four courtesy parking

spaces. The entrance should be placed further down the Lane to prevent this. It was agreed we would talk to Websters. **(Action)**

- Would there be a loss of house pricing if there is a loss of parking? Prices of housing is usually affected by demand, but we cannot categorically confirm whether a home's value would reduce due to the loss of 'courtesy' parking. However, as with the action point above, we will talk with Websters regarding their plans.
- It was suggested that LVRP release some of their land to accommodate parking for visitors such as dog walkers & fishermen to their land, as they have in Marsh Lane. A lot of cars that park along Netherfield Lane, are those using the LVRP. This was a valid suggestion and one that we would speak to LVRP about **(Action)**
- Traffic calming is required on Roydon Road where it's very dangerous, especially the turning into the Lane. All agreed and this is an action point for the Transport Group to take up with EHDC & County Councillor. The group were advised that there had been various meetings with EHDC about parking and speeding etc. Surveys continue to be carried out and where EHDC advise that there are no issues in the village, that this is something we disagree with and continue to raise with them **(Action)**
- How many affordable homes were there planned for Websters site? It was advised that this would be approx. 40% which equates to 24 dwellings. It was also advised that if the field was brought into the plan, that the Baesh Trust would work with the developer for 6 community homes to be built. These would be for local people and members of the Baesh Trust. The Chappelfield site would produce 7 affordable homes. It was pointed out that the Catesby site offer is very attractive and would offer more affordable homes. It was made clear that the informal meeting was being given to local residents to discuss the Netherfield Lane issues and was not about other sites. The discussion became heated and a temporary halt to the meeting was introduced to allow calm and respect to be restored.
- It was noted that there is no provision to have affordable on one site. Our priority currently is to find sites.
- A question as to whether a meeting at the Catesby Site or other sites could be offered? There were no plans to hold further informal discussions at other sites but that this will be taken under due consideration **(Action)**
- The residents were told that Websters are willing to sign a covenant that confirms they will not build more dwellings than their plans state if this provides some reassurance to those who feel once the application is approved, that more dwellings would then be built.
- The number of homes were reviewed. On the Brownfield Site there are 20 homes, so this leaves approx. 39 short. The call for sites was mentioned and we advised that The Thames Water site could provide 10 homes and Marsh Lane approx. 20. The BT site is not an option and another site

brought forward is in flood zone 3, so is also not possible. Residents felt that the Marsh Lane site was a good option if LVRP agreed to provide the required numbers.

- We were asked whether LVRP had responded to us about the sites in their area, which to date they have not. Whilst the Websters site also sits in the LVRP, access to Netherfield Lane is not a main point of entrance to their facilities, as is Marsh Lane. We will be chasing them however for their responses.
- Drainage issues – We are aware there is a main sewage pipe through the centre of the field and that drainage/flooding was on Websters radar. As part of our consultation process, we have to ask various authorities to look at our proposals. LVRP being one. If they oppose our plans, we will need to go back to the drawing board.
- What about the current District Plan review and the numbers? We advised that all District Plans were being reviewed and that it was most definitely likely that the number of dwellings would increase in the plan, which is why adopting a NP was so important.
- Views and vistas are important and that the view of the field would be lost due to a housing estate from a main road. We said that this could also be argued for the sites known as The Granary, The Spinney and the 'Hobbit' Houses, which sit on the busy Hoddesdon Road.
- The owner of the house on the main road (Cat Hill) advised that his garden is 6ft lower than the field and every 6 weeks they have to clear the sewage drainage. There is concern whether this would be seriously affected by potential future building? There is no building planned on the incline where the garden overlooks the field but would be something we can raise with Websters **(Action)**
- Residents thanked the group for giving their personal time to listen to the concerns and views of the Netherfield Lane residents. The group thanked the residents and asked that we continue to talk to each other whilst we go through this process.

Nothing further was discussed, and the meeting was concluded.