

Sirs,

I wish to express my objections to the Preferred Options you have issued for Public Consultation.

Having seen a number of very good technical points made by various groups, I am taking a different approach in expressing my views on your poorly thought through document.

I have a long history of involvement in Baldock including serving time as treasurer and chairman of St Marys School PTA, serving time on committees such as the Baldock Festival, I was a founding Director of the Baldock Town Partnership, I was Chairman of the Baldock Town hall Group, I was, at the request of Sir Oliver Heald, Chairman of the Baldock Cemetary Group, I am currently Chairman of the Baldock Society and the Baldock Neighbourhood Panel, I run an annual event at the Knights Templar Academy, but I am writing to you as a resident of an historic Town. Because of my long term involvement in Baldock I think I can talk with some in depth knowledge of why this town is special and why your proposals are quite frankly unsuitable.

I have not met one person who opposes development in and around Baldock, but likewise I have not met one person, outside of your council, who thinks you have done a proper or reasonable job in developing these proposals. Baldock has always been open to change as demonstrated by the extensive numbers of infill developments within the town, including the loss of important buildings such as South Lodge. The extensive development at Clothall common went ahead increasing the size of the town significantly at that time. THIS IS NOT A NIMBY ISSUE.

Your proposals give no thought to a strategic development or make any assessment of future need to this area, it is a simple box ticking exercise to meet the land requirements for the housing numbers required.

You have made no significant attempt to find suitable land and have relied completely on land being put forward regardless of location and suitability, you have taken the easy path rather than the proper path.

The proposals will put untenable pressures on the historic town centre with respect to traffic movements. You have not undertaken the necessary traffic studies.

Baldock Town centre has been recognised as unique and worth protecting by successive governments (please refer to the submission from the Baldock Local History Society) Towns like Baldock are increasingly rare and must be protected, from vandals like yourselves. Even by your own admission, these are poor proposals and you have only issued them in an unfounded fear of developers taking advantage of your inability to keep an up to date Local Plan.

The loss of Green belt is totally unacceptable, we lost a large chunk of Green Belt when Clothall Common was built and now we stand to loose even more.

Your disregard for government policy on Green Belt development is staggering, unacceptable and immoral. If you do not redraft your thoughts and include more suitable sites the I cannot see your Plan passing the Inspection stage in which case you will be guilty of wasting a considerable amount of council tax payers money. You seriously need to think again.

In summary I object to your whole plan, your site allocations and urge you to rethink the whole plan for the district based on the districts needs.

We have something special in Baldock and we will not let you destroy it. The solution is simple, we just need another town that is not within green belt land, talk to Cambridgeshire.

Because of my long term involvement with various groups, I would reiterate these are my personal views and are not in any way associated with any group views. These views are expressed without prejudice or malice

Thank you,

Chris Gomm
Baldock Resident.
1 Norton Road,
Baldock
SG7 5AP