

11 Echo Hill
Royston
Herts
SG8 9BB

Ben Glover
Senior Planning Officer
North Hertfordshire District Council
Council Offices
Gernon Road
Letchworth Garden City
Hertfordshire
SG6 3JF

8th August 2025

Dear Mr Glover,

Reference: 25/01708/OP Land Opposite Heath Farm Briary Lane Royston Hertfordshire

I write in connection with the above planning application, I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the development of houses in this location.

The development on this site is not supported by the Local Plan, and isn't required to meet housing supply as there has already been considerable development recently in Royston.

Were the proposed development to take place, there would be negative impact on the local landscape. This was the basis for the refusal of the previous application, and very little has changed. The view from both our street and Therfield Heath (a SSSI) will be negatively affected, during the demolition of No. 24, the construction process, and resultant housing. The proposals conflict with the NPPF and Policy CGB1, SP5, SP12, NE1 and NE6 of the NHDC Local Plan. There has not been any consideration to the direct effects of the access proposals on the character of Echo Hill which would be harmed by the proposed access arrangements. The proposals would therefore be contrary to the general landscape protection policies of the NPPF (including Paragraph 135), Policies NE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

The development would loom large over our area of Echo Hill. This is the view from our bedroom window. The arrow shows where new houses would appear. The current field is a pleasure to look at. The proposed buffer is very slim in our part of Echo Hill. Our living conditions will be severely impacted by the construction, and there will be a net loss of green space after it is completed.



The proposed development would, in my view, have catastrophic impact on highways and traffic. Echo Hill, Briary Lane and Sun Hill are already narrow and congested with traffic and parked cars. As well as residents, people park here for free to use the train station. Since the closure of the Princes Mews car park ('Morrisons') there has been an increase in the number of parked cars. I drive down Briary Lane regularly and always have to wait and zigzag. I don't know how construction traffic would be able to get through, nor the increased amount of traffic from new residents. There is a disabled parking space on Sun Hill which also would impede additional traffic.

The roads in this area are steep. Visitors exclaim to me in surprise that Echo Hill really is a 'hill'! You can see the slopes from these photos.



I have walked up and down this hill while pregnant, and pushing a pram for three years. Neither was easy. The slope is considerable, which makes it unsuitable for new residents with additional

mobility requirements. In winter residents have to salt the roads as they are lethal in snow and ice. There are many blind junctions.

In my photos you can see the vehicles parked on the roads and pavements. Often I have pushed my daughter's buggy in the road when the pavement is blocked. With additional traffic that will all become more dangerous. When she starts school I would be reluctant to let her walk due to the additional hazards. Please also see the following Facebook post from Royston Fire Station. We had a substantial house fire in recent years, and the consequences would have been even worse if the three fire engines and police car were unable to park nearby due to construction traffic or additional parked cars.



Royston Fire Station

23m · 🌐



Last night, we attended a property in Royston for an emergency call, unfortunately we were unable to park our appliance at the address due to inconsiderate parking.

This causes substantial delays in our response and ultimately puts peoples lives at risk, including our own.

Fortunately, on this occasion the fire was out on arrival.

Please consider the size of emergency vehicles when you park yours, it may save you a 2 minuet walk, but it could cost so much more.

Stay Safe,



As you know from the previous refusal, the demolition of no. 24 still does not give a wide enough space for access.

There would be negative impact on the ecology of the area. I have seen a plethora of photos from neighbours of wildlife in the field, some of which are of protected species. This will also negatively affect Therfield Heath, a SSSI. The development of the site will result in the loss of high-quality agricultural land.

Royston is currently struggling with access to services at GP surgeries and NHS dentists, and the development would make this worse. As stated above, Royston has recently had considerable housing development.

We would like to make you aware of restrictive covenants which are in place in Echo Hill and which we as a resident(s) of Echo Hill have the benefit of, and we reserve the right to take enforcement action if these covenants are breached.

The covenants were wrongly dismissed by NHDC planning during the previous determination of planning application 20/00744/OP.

The enforcement of the covenants would be a lengthy legal process possibly taking several years to be resolved. A tribunal action would therefore significantly delay the deliverability of the development.

This factor therefore means that the possibility of a lengthy delay to implementation will become a material planning consideration in the decision-making process.

You are aware from the previously refused applications for this site the strength of feeling against this development from the community of Royston and the significant impact this development will have directly to the residents of Echo Hill. A letter from an Appointed Solicitor was issued to both Gladman and Number 24 Echo Hill during the previous application of 20/00744/OP, regarding the breach of the covenants and the intention for enforcement action, this remains the case for this latest application and Echo Hill residents will pursue this going forward for this latest application.

In addition, if the community is successful with enforcing the covenants and preventing the demolition of Number 24, both the construction traffic and main site access would not be able to enter the site via Echo Hill, the alternative would be to use the bridleway and therefore the reasons for refusal in the 2018 application associated with the negative impact to the neighbouring SSSI would still stand.

Therefore, due to the protective covenants in place, which residents of Echo Hill will enforce, it cannot be guaranteed that Gladman will be able to deliver this site and therefore this site cannot contribute towards the 5-year NHDC housing supply.

To summarise, in considering all the above points, I strongly urge the council to reject this damaging and unsustainable planning proposal.

Yours sincerely,
Eleanor Brown