

23 Echo Hill
Royston
Herts
SG8 9BB

August 16th 2025

To:

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

Dear Mr Glover,

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

I recently wrote in objection to the above planning application.

Since that objection I have noted that the application shows plans to connect a foul sewer to a manhole located on land that is owned by my wife and myself. Gladman have not consulted us on this and have certainly not served the appropriate certificate that is required by planning regulations when making use of land not under their control. This further reinforces another point I made, that Gladman have included many errors and misleading statements in their application. They can't even be bothered to establish simple facts. We absolutely refuse to have the waste from another 84 houses pass through this manhole and subsequent sewer pipe, also on our land, which if they became blocked, would be our responsibility and cost.

In my objection I pointed out very strongly that the steep gradient of the immediate access road, proposed to be via demolition of no. 24 Echo Hill, was unacceptable and alone was reason for rejection of the application. It has now been established that the gradient exceeds 10%, more than **double the advisable limit** and thus confirming that it is unacceptable under planning regulations. This was demonstrated in the Haskoning Transport report submitted in objection to the application.

Such a simple measurement should have been made by Highways in their appraisal of the planning application. It is very disappointing when the experts, upon whom we members of the public rely, do not carry out their duties with due diligence. While it is encouraging that their report recommended refusal on sustainability grounds, it should also have recommended refusal on safety (in particular the hugely excessive gradient) and other non-compliance grounds, items that even I with no relevant experience, pointed out in my objection. The reference to out of date, withdrawn guidelines, as pointed out in the expert Haskoning report, to justify the application should also have been noted, and which basically negate the Gladman transport report completely

The application should therefore be rejected. In fact, since it does not conform to regulations regarding use of land not under their control, as presumably Gladman signed a form stating that they had control of all the land included in their application, should not even be considered.

Yours Sincerely



Dr RP Munden