



CORE STRATEGY REPORT OF CONSULTATION

Summary of Responses from the Public Consultation on the Emerging Core Strategy

(June – August 2009)

Volume 4 Annex A

Includes:

- **Summary of general public responses**

First published: July 2010

Edited: March 2011

Reprinted: October 2011

This publication is **Annex A to Volume 4 of the Report of Consultation on the Core Strategy**. If you would like this information in your own language, or you would like to contact the Council about any other issue, please call 01442 867212.. If you would like this information in your own language, or you would like to contact the Council about any other issue, please call 01442 867212.

If you would like this information in another format, such as large print or audio tape, please call 01442 228660 or for Minicom only 01442 867877.

本刊物是核心策畧諮詢報告的第四卷—
附件A。你如欲獲得此資訊的中文版，或有任何其他事宜欲聯絡地方政府
，請致電01442 867212。

閣下如欲以其他形式獲得此資料，例如大字版或錄音帶，請致電01442
228660 或聾人電話01442 867877。

یہ اشاعت مرکزی لائحہ عملی پر مشاورتی رپورٹ کی جلد 4 - اینیکس A ہے۔ اگر آپ یہ معلومات اپنی زبان میں پاتے ہیں، یا کونسل سے کسی اور
مسئلے کے بارے میں رابطہ کرنا پاتے ہیں، تو برائے مہربانی 01442 867212 پر فون کریں۔

اگر آپ یہ معلومات کسی اور شکل میں پاتے ہیں جیسے بڑی چھپائی یا آڈیو ٹیپ تو برائے مہربانی فون کریں 01442 228660 یا صرف منی کام
کے لئے 01442 867877۔

આ પ્રકાશન કેન્દ્રિય વ્યુહરચના વિશેનો મસલત અહેવાલ ગ્રંથ ૪ - પરિશિષ્ટ એ છે. જો આ માહિતી તમારે તમારી
પોતાની ભાષામાં મેળવવી હોય તો અથવા તો બીજા કોઈ પણ મુદ્દા વિશે તમારે કાઉન્સિલનો સંપર્ક કરવો હોય તો,
મહેરબાની કરી 01442 867212 ઉપર સંપર્ક કરો.

જો આ માહિતી તમારે બીજા આકારમાં, જેમ કે મોટી છાપ, અથવા ધ્વનિ ટેપ (ઓડિયો ટેપ) માં મેળવવી હોય તો,
મહેરબાની કરી 01442 228660 ઉપર સંપર્ક કરો અથવા ફક્ત મીનીકોમ માટે 01442 867877 ઉપર ફોન કરો.

Report of Consultation

The Core Strategy for Dacorum Borough has been prepared taking account of Government policy and regulation, technical evidence and consultation. Consultation has spanned seven years, from 2005 to June 2011. This report explains the consultation: i.e.

- the means of publicity used;
- the nature of the consultation;
- the main responses elicited;
- the main issues raised; and
- how they have been taken into account.

It also explains how the actual consultation relates to the Council's policy on consultation and engagement, the Statement of Community Involvement.

The report is presented in seven volumes:

- Volume 1:** Emerging Issues and Options (June 2005 - July 2006)
- *Annex A* contains a summary of responses from the organisations consulted
- Volume 2:** Growth at Hemel Hempstead and Other Stakeholder Consultation (July 2006 –April 2009)
- Volume 3:** Stakeholder Workshops (September 2008 – January 2009)
- *Annex A* contains reports on each workshop
- Volume 4:** Emerging Core Strategy (May - September 2009)
- *Annex A* contains a summary of responses to the general public consultation
- *Annex B* contains reports from the Citizens' Panel and Gypsy and Traveller community
- Volume 5:** Writing the Core Strategy - from Working Draft to Consultation Draft (June – September 2010)
- Volume 6:** Consultation Draft Core Strategy (November 2010 – June 2011)
- *Annex A* contains a summary of responses to the general public consultation and reports from the Citizens' Panel and Town Centre Workshop. It also includes changes made to the Draft Core Strategy.
- Volume 7:** Overview

This is Annex A to Volume 4.

Contents page

Summary of Public Responses

	Page
1. Themes	1
2. Places	75
• Berkhamsted	77
• Bovingdon	113
• Hemel Hempstead	147
• Kings Langley	179
• Markyate	203
• Tring	219
• Countryside	245
 Appendix 1: Duplicate comments received on the Berkhamsted section of the consultation document.	 263

1. THEMES

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the aims listed, which will help achieve the Borough vision?

Responses received	291		
Yes -			
Key organisations	23	No clear answer:	
Individuals	143	Key organisations	5
Landowners	19	Individuals	1
Total	185 responses	Landowners	0
		Total	6
No -			
Key organisations	7		
Individuals	92		
Landowners	1		
Total	100 responses		

Response	Actions
-----------------	----------------

<p>Despite objections, there is a substantial level of support for the aims listed, and some amendments are suggested.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Herts County Council (Transport) supports the aim to promote an integrated transport network, public transport, cycling and walking. This can be achieved via Local and Urban Transport Plans.</p> <p>The Primary Care Trust (PCT) would welcome a stronger focus on the promotion of physical activity through prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists and development of attractive and safe public places.</p> <p>The Manor Estate Residents Association request an additional aim:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new development should incorporate solar panels and ground source heat pumps. <p>The British Wind Energy Association (BWEA) would like a stronger commitment to increased energy efficiency and renewable energy technology.</p> <p>Dacorum Environmental Forum (DEF) ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the aim of a 'vibrant and prosperous economy' to be subject to ensuring a high quality of life. 	<p>Expand on the Borough Vision and better link to the place visions.</p> <p>Review aims set out to help achieve the Borough vision.</p>
---	--

- for bullet point 5 to be changed to ‘...minimise the overall need to travel by private car’
- that bullet point 6 require development to address other impacts of climate change (in addition to flooding).

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society want to add an aim:

- ‘Taking into account the need to preserve or enhance tranquillity across the Borough as appropriate’.

Box Moor Trust would like the vision to include the words ‘sustainable’ and/or ‘green’ when describing the place. It suggests additional aims:

- ‘Reduce the reliance on the use of the private car by ensuring that key services and facilities are easily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.’
- ‘Ensuring that the right social infrastructure is in place and that the delivery of the Vision includes the ongoing involvement of local people.’

The Environment Agency (EA) suggests:

- a new aim - ‘Ensuring, by the efficient re-use of land, that contamination from previous industrial use is cleaned up.’
- that bullet point 6 also refers to *water* efficient buildings and measures to protect buildings from the risk of flooding.’ (Water use reduction is as important as energy efficiency due to the ‘serious water stress’ status of the Thames Region (including Dacorum)).

Hemel Hempstead GM Action Group supports the aims, but with the following additions:

- to bullet point 12 - ‘sustainable and safe’ before ‘use’;
- to bullet point 13 - ‘ensuring an environment free from industrial hazards’;
- to bullet point 14 - ‘generating a framework for food security with safe production of local food for local people minimising the carbon footprint.’

The Council’s Sustainability Officer supports the aims, but with an amended version of bullet point 6:

- ‘Ensure all development is sufficiently adaptable and fit for purpose to meet future climate change demands.’

Natural England would like 'conserving and enhancing... biological and geological diversity' to be higher up the list.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer department at DBC agrees with the aims, but is concerned that the evidence for supporting diversity, equality of opportunity and social inclusion is not as strong as evidence for some of the other aims.

The Chilterns Conservation Board suggests amendments:

- Bullet point 6 should include specific support for water efficiency in new buildings.
- Bullet point 10 should read '...conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB'.

Dacorum Heritage Trust particularly supports the objective to protect architectural and environmental heritage.

Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats seek an amendment:

- the fourth bullet point should read '...to enable the successful delivery and integration of new neighbourhoods...'

The Homes and Communities Agency supports the aims, in particular those relating to a mix of uses and tenures, sustainability and encouragement on non-car travel and the promotion of social inclusion and diversity.

The East of England Development Agency (EEDA) supports the aims, in particular the reference to economic aspiration and the recognition of the role of Maylands and Hemel Hempstead town centre.

London Luton Airport Operations Limited (LLAOL) supports the aim of 'creating opportunities for a vibrant and prosperous economy across the Borough', but wants reference to Luton Airport as one of the key strengths of Dacorum's economy.

Hertfordshire County Council (Environment Department) agrees with the aims, but suggests the East of England Plan's aspirations for Hemel Hempstead are added.

British Waterways supports the aims, but would like them grouped to show their relation to the themes. It would like greater emphasis on recreation, sport, tourism and healthy living. The Core Strategy diagram should also refer to

recreation.

Herts and North Middlesex Ramblers want to promote pedestrian access to the countryside and better pedestrian access in urban areas. They expect development to contribute to improving the pedestrian network and routes.

McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles:

- The aims do not adequately address the needs of the ageing population. Planning policies will need to be developed to address the ageing population: this will include lifetime homes, specialist older people's accommodation and design and place setting.

The Jehovah's Witnesses:

- In order for bullet point 1 (quality of life) to be achieved sufficient sites for community use must be identified.

Herts Biological Records Centre:

- The vision omits any reference to local distinctiveness, which should play a key role in the design of new developments and should be mentioned in the vision.

The Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council are unclear what is meant by sustainability.

Berkhamsted Town Council says that some aims are unrealistic and some contradict each other. It comments on implications for the town:

- Infrastructure provision in Berkhamsted is already inadequate for the level of development proposed
- An integrated transport network will be difficult and expensive to implement
- The Green Belt and Chilterns AONB should not be eroded any further
- Brownfield land should be built on before greenfield, but garden infilling should be strictly controlled
- While aiming for high quality design, there must also be variety of design.
- [Residential] character areas should be given greater emphasis in order to maintain the character of the towns and villages.
- The market towns need a range of social, leisure and community facilities as well as Hemel Hempstead.

Markyate Care Group is worried that Markyate will be adversely changed.

Comments from individuals:

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- The aims should be prioritised as some contradict each other.
- The list of aims is full of contradictions for example:
 - 'delivering the required level of new homes' and 'conserving and enhancing the Borough's landscape character, open space etc.'
 - 'ensuring the efficient use of existing land' and 'maintaining the variety and character of towns and villages'.
 - 'delivering the required level of new homes' and 'protecting and strengthening the role of the Borough's two market towns and large villages.'
- The aims listed will not help achieve the borough vision.
- This is a wish list and does not address the current issue of overcrowding and decaying infrastructure.
- The aims do not take account of the local people and the local community: they focus too strongly on the physical environment and are therefore not democratic. The only use of the word community is in the final bullet point and reflects a Government ambition, rather than a Dacorum one. This aim is already enshrined in national policy and should not be included without reference to local context. The disregard for the local community within the aims makes the strategy irrelevant as the local community and people are the foundation of a sustainable community. The strategy reflects national goals rather than local ones, which will lead to resentment and failure of the strategy.
- The vision should include a key statement with a mandatory commitment to environmental/green issues.
- The aims suggest overdevelopment.
- Infrastructure is already insufficient.
- It is doubted that funding for the necessary infrastructure will be available.
- There should be clarity about school provision alongside new housing.
- The aims do not take into account the effects on the

existing population.

- The vision should include a new hospital to go with all the growth.
- It proposes too much growth too quickly to integrate with the existing community.
- There should be more emphasis on reduced speed limits in built up areas and off-street parking provision.
- There should be provision for more cycle and pedestrian routes.
- It is not realistic to promote an integrated transport network unless safety issues for cyclists are addressed.
- Rural enterprises must be allowed for uses other than just farming.
- New homes should only be occupied by people who do not commute outside the borough.
- The Green Belt and the character of towns and villages must be protected.
- Hemel Hempstead needs more facilities, especially parking, before it can accommodate any more development.
- There is no need to build new neighbourhoods on Green Belt land: they can all be accommodated on brownfield land around Hemel Hempstead.
- Hemel Hempstead has many run down areas that could be redeveloped for new housing or facilities.
- Enhancing Hemel Hempstead must not come at the expense of the other towns. If reduction in car travel is an aim then the right mix of facilities must be provided. The right context should be given for social inclusion: it cannot be forced.
- There is no need for further development in Bovingdon.
- The character, image and social profile of Berkhamsted will be altered.
- Any development around Tring will reduce the quality of life for residents and destroy the town's character.

People who agreed added the following caveats:

- The needs of the whole community must be considered and met.
- There should be more focus on local employment, renewable resources and low carbon targets for building developments.

- There is an over emphasis on development and not enough on improving quality of life of residents.
- The list is long and covers many areas – it needs to be kept simple, and in some order of priority.
- Development should not encroach into the Green Belt.
- There should be greater emphasis on enhancing the countryside, Green Belt, the Chilterns AONB and the rivers and canals.
- There should be greater emphasis on minimising growth at the market towns and villages.
- Farming and local growing of food should be encouraged.
- The constraints within the different parts of the borough must be recognised.
- The vision is very exciting but it is important to ensure that the correct infrastructure is delivered along with any new development. In particular sufficient health and education facilities must be provided.
- There needs to be more emphasis on enhanced educational facilities.
- Improved provision for cars will be essential.
- The aims do not address the overriding concerns about the increasing population in the south east.
- The type, tenure and size of new dwellings should be consistent with existing local area, rather than to meet a target.

Some people raised points not directly related to the aims or the vision:

- Gypsies and Travellers do not want to be integrated with the settled community and want their own space.
- The loss of faith of Hemel Hempstead as an economic centre stems from the presence of Buncefield, which should be removed.
- The Council's top priority should be cost efficiency and this should be reflected within the vision and aims.

Comments from landowners:

- Particular support is given for:
 - the aim 'to create opportunities for a vibrant and prosperous economy across the Borough';

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - efficient and effective use and an integrated transport network; and - the use of previously developed land. • The aims are supported, but they should be written in a style that encourages sustainable development. • The aims are supported, but the Council must be realistic about what can be provided through planning gain so as not put off developers. • Section 2 should be amended as follows: ‘The Local Development Framework will help achieve this strategic vision by seeking to:’ and the bullet points amended accordingly. • The first bullet point should have ‘...but is sufficiently flexible so as not to unduly constrain development.’ added to the end. • The second bullet point should be reworded to reflect the emphasis on RSS housing targets being minima rather than ceilings. Hemel Hempstead needs sufficient growth to deliver new facilities and infrastructure to meet its designation as a key centre for development and change. The level of growth is linked to the provision of infrastructure for new neighbourhoods: the scale of development in particular locations needs to be large enough to support infrastructure. A new neighbourhood should be at least 1,500 dwellings. • There should be a greater emphasis on the need for improvements to the range and quality of retail provision in Hemel Hempstead town centre to prevent loss of trade to other centres. Retail is a key driver of the economic prosperity of the Borough. • While agreeing with the aims, it is questioned whether it is realistic to view Hemel Hempstead as a sub-regional business hub. • There should be greater recognition of the need to make Hemel Hempstead a more attractive place to shop and visit. • In smaller villages, where there is a need for development, building on greenfield land should be allowed if no brownfield land is available. • Efficient use of existing land should not reduce the quality of life in urban areas, i.e. where high residential densities are proposed. • Joint working with St Albans is key to the Core Strategy. 	
---	--

- Mixed use development should be promoted.
- The aims may need to be balanced against each other.

QUESTION 2

Do you agree with the principle of placing sustainable development at the heart of the Core Strategy

Responses received	247
Yes - Key organisations	27
Individuals	162
Landowners	20
Total	209 responses
No - Key organisations	0
Individuals	38
Landowners	0
Total	38 responses

Response

Actions

There is substantial for this principle, with some qualifying comments and provisos.

Comments from key organisations:

EEDA supports the principle as it aligns with the spatial goals and priorities of the regional economic strategy.

Herts County Council (Transport) supports the principle and state that improved passenger transport/walk/cycle networks are key to this.

Hertfordshire Police Authority supports the principle, and states that the creation of crime-free and safe environments represents a key part of sustainable development which should be embedded throughout the Core Strategy and its policies. The police authority is a key delivery vehicle for the creation of safe environments.

The Council's Sustainability Officer and the Dacorum Environmental Forum (DEF) applaud the principle but point out that sustainable development is important for many reasons other than climate change, such as pollution, resource depletion, biodiversity, health and community cohesion.

Carry forward the principle of placing sustainable development at the heart of the Core Strategy and explain it more fully.

Modify the sustainability diagram to reflect new chapter titles.

The Hemel Hempstead GM Action Group agree provided that sustainable development includes healthy and safe ways of living.

Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats would like an overriding principle of sustainable development with a focus on taking the built environment towards carbon neutrality.

The Jehovah's Witnesses agree but feel that sufficient community sites must be included to cater for expansion.

Berkhamsted Town Council states that the level of housing growth will only be sustainable if supporting infrastructure is provided. They are concerned about the number of trees lost during development and believe that further loss of garden space is unsustainable.

Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust agrees but thinks that more emphasis should be placed on the protection and enhancement of the environment and biodiversity.

Herts Biological Records Centre supports the principle but asks that its aims are fully expressed to cover:

- social progress;
- effective protection of the environment;
- prudent use of natural resources; and
- the maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

The Chilterns Society and London Green Belt Council disagree because it is not clear what is meant by sustainability.

Comments from individuals:

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- Sustainable development is important, but should be balanced against other objectives.
- We need to address the problems with infrastructure before further development.
- Development will overload the infrastructure and lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution.
- It is nonsense to address climate change in this way – individual settlements cannot go back to being self

sufficient.

- Local farmland should be used for local food provision.
- Local farmland should be preserved for local people.
- Theme 4 (looking after the environment) should come first.
- Brownfield sites should be developed preferentially.
- The Core Strategy structure diagram ignores the local community and local people who are/will be the foundation of a sustainable community and without whose support this strategy is irrelevant. The framework reflects national goals rather than local ones which are more conservative and sustainable. Without recognising the role and importance of the local community as the foundation of a sustainable community the strategy will not be democratic or relevant to local people.
- Hemel Hempstead needs more facilities, especially parking, before it can accommodate any more development.
- It is unsafe to have new housing and business development within Maylands while Buncefield is still there.
- The town and environs cannot support the level of development proposed.
- The strategy aims to make Hemel Hempstead too big. Now that the hospital has gone, people have to travel much further.
- The character, image and social profile of Berkhamsted will be altered.
- Previous over development of Berkhamsted and lack of infrastructure.
- There is no need for large numbers of housing in Bovingdon.

People who agreed made the following points:

- Sustainable development must be tackled as a long term aim, rather than through short term fixes.
- 'Sustainable' must be defined. We will require more drastic measures to address climate change, for example wind turbines and solar harnessing.
- Sustainable development means planning for the needs of residents.

- Sustainability must be at the heart of all developments, not just added on as an after thought.
- There need to be specific targets for sustainability.
- The strategy should take a lead on sustainability, in areas such as buildings that conserve water and energy, provision of better and more cycle ways and energy efficient public transport.
- Sufficient school places must be provided within walking distance of new development.
- Sustainable development is essential to the core strategy but does not need to be at the heart of it. Social considerations are equally important, and efforts to reduce emissions must be kept in perspective.
- Sustainability must be balanced against the needs of the community, the capacity of infrastructure and the environment.
- Provision of housing should be linked to employment opportunities.
- Sustainable development is a contradiction in terms. We have reached a tipping point and cannot continue to build at the current rate without it having devastating consequences for natural resources and biodiversity.
- One way of reducing carbon emissions is by not building large developments on the edge of Berkhamsted where public transport and retail facilities are poor. Berkhamsted has run out sensible development land.
- Does sustainable development have to mean more houses?

Comments from landowners:

- The core strategy must include all the fundamental principles of sustainable development as set out in the Government's 1999 Sustainable Development Strategy. This implies that sites well-related to an existing settlement and close to public transport links should be strongly considered as locations for future growth.
- Concentrating development within existing urban areas contributes to the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption.
- Improvements in energy efficiency and green infrastructure are more likely to be achieved through new neighbourhoods than piecemeal development.

- There needs to be more emphasis on the need to promote cultural/lifestyle change.
- Any requirements limiting the use of natural resources and 'future proofing' should be on a site specific basis and adopt a flexible approach.
- Any policies relating energy efficiency and renewable energy should take a flexible or graduated approach as there is uncertainty about future technologies. It would be counter-productive to be overly prescriptive given the likelihood that there will be significant enhancements in technology.
- Whilst the principle is supported, greater certainty as to what is required from developers is required. Requirements must be balanced so they do not stifle development.
- Whilst the approach is supported, it is noted that the four themes will not always be compatible.
- The approach to sustainability should be more strategic and encourage renewable energy provision at the district level.
- A key part of sustainable development is to improve the quality of life for all, including those in small villages. PPS3 outlines the importance of the delivery of housing in rural areas to the sustainability of rural communities (paras 3, 9 and 38).
- Sustainable development must tie in with economic growth.

QUESTION 3

Do you agree with the development strategy as described?

Responses received 240

Yes - Key organisations 16
 Individuals 105
 Landowners 19
Total 140 responses

No clear answer:
 Key organisations 3
 Individuals 3
 Landowners 0
Total 6

No - Key organisations 5
 Individuals 84
 Landowners 5

Total	
94 responses	
Response	Actions
<p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability Officer is concerned that numbering the themes 1-4 makes them appear as separate issues. Sustainable development is at the heart of the strategy and should run through all other themes. By removing the numbering, the concern would be overcome.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Police Authority objects to the development strategy because it does not set the correct context for delivering sustainable communities. A key part of creating sustainable communities is to create safe environments. Policy ENV7 of the East of England Plan seeks to deliver development which addresses crime prevention and community safety. The development strategy fails to recognise the impact that growth will have on infrastructure, including the police. It should set out the requirement for additional infrastructure and establish policy to enable developer contributions to be sought for infrastructure.</p> <p>Herts Fire and Rescue Service states that there may be a need for further service provision, if there was a sizeable development more than 10 minutes from the nearest fire station.</p> <p>Herts County Council (Transport) points out that concentrating housing and economic development at Hemel Hempstead provides an opportunity to improve passenger transport (the new bus station will be an important part of this). It also creates an opportunity to enhance pedestrian and cycling facilities.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board considers that it will be difficult to plan the location, accessibility and design of development so as to reduce carbon emissions, energy and natural resource consumption and waste. New development will lead to a significant increase in the demand for water and the Council will need to consider how this will be met.</p> <p>The Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council assert that new development must be accompanied by the appropriate infrastructure and jobs provision.</p>	<p>Take forward the strategy for the distribution of development.</p> <p>Provide further guidance on the settlement hierarchy and selecting locations for development.</p>

Friends of the Earth point out that we should be careful to achieve ecologically sustainable economic growth that leads to social justice.

Dacorum Environmental Forum (DEF) says that the assertion, that towns and villages need investment and growth to sustain themselves, should be couched in terms of sustainable development. It also says we should grow the economy in a green, sustainable direction, with low land take and low carbon impact.

The Highways Agency broadly supports the development strategy, but is concerned that by allowing new housing development at the smaller settlements, residents will not have the same level of access to jobs, retail and other facilities as those at Hemel Hempstead. Development should be accompanied by enhancements to public transport infrastructure and improvements to accessibility between settlements.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer comments that it is misleading to say that population growth may not occur given the housing targets discussed. Small scale social housing should be considered for the majority of villages, except very small settlements.

The Manor Estate Residents Association believes that the market towns and large villages should have some additional housing so that they can benefit from improved infrastructure and facilities.

Berkhamsted Town Council supports the development strategy but requests policy on garden infilling and windfall developments – i.e. where it will and will not be allowed.

EEDA recognises the significance of Hemel Hempstead as a key centre for development and change and its importance as part of the London Arc Engine of Growth.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society supports the strategy but is concerned that there may be conflict between the strategy of maintaining a stable population at the market towns and large villages and potential development options there.

Comments from individuals:

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- We must consider issues and people outside of

Dacorum, and the issue of rising population across the South East as a whole. If we accept the level of development proposed, quality of life for all will fall irreversibly.

- Planning for 6,500 or 17,000 new homes is not marginal or sustainable.
- The aim of the strategy is to meet a political target rather than what is best for the borough.
- The focus for development should be on promoting local businesses and local employment.
- The population of the market towns and large villages will not remain stable. Rising population will demand change.
- The strategy will lead to the loss of the historic character of the market towns.
- Development in villages in the Green Belt should be restricted, except for small infill sites.
- The strategy reduces the amount of open space, Green Belt and farmland.
- There is contradiction between the aim of protecting the Green Belt, and development on parts of the Green Belt.
- Brownfield sites should be developed preferentially.
- The strategy proposes too much development which will lead to more congestion.
- The area is approaching gridlock and cannot cope with any more housing.
- It is doubted whether funding for necessary infrastructure would be available.
- It fails to address the real issues of congestion and lack of open space.
- So much in the way of community, leisure and health facilities will be needed to support all the growth, but there is not enough money for all this.
- Infilling should only be allowed where it does not ruin views for surrounding houses.
- Potential extensions to Hemel Hempstead conflict with promoting restraint in the countryside
- The strategy places too much development at Hemel Hempstead. While Hemel should take the main share of new development, the strategy should balance it a bit more across the other towns and large villages.
- Development should not be focussed at Hemel

Hempstead: it should be spread over the borough.

- Hemel Hempstead is big enough and should not be expanded any further.
- There should be greater emphasis on infilling, rather than extending into the Green Belt at Hemel Hempstead.
- There needs to more focus on sustainable housing, commercial and industrial development on the western side of town to reduce cross-town traffic at rush hour.
- Hemel Hempstead needs more facilities, especially parking, before it can accommodate any more development.
- The level of development proposed at Maylands is too high and will put pressure on existing services. The Area Action Plan should be clearer as to which areas are to be redeveloped (and their current use).
- While redevelopment of the Maylands area is desirable, it should not extend beyond its current boundaries, nor should it be closer to Buncefield. The existence of Buncefield [Oil Terminal] means it is not appropriate to expand the Maylands area.
- Dwellings should be located closer to large businesses, i.e. around Maylands.
- The character, image and social profile of Berkhamsted will be altered.
- The proposed development site at Durrants Lane/ Shootersway is too far from town centre. There should be no more development on Shootersway.
- Berkhamsted lacks infrastructure and has been overdeveloped.

People who agreed made the following comments/caveats:

- There should be more family homes rather than flats.
- Any potential greenfield development must be consulted on early.
- New development should be locally distinctive and avoid large generic shops.
- Hemel Hempstead is the logical place to incorporate most of the new housing and economic growth. However, the market towns and large villages should be allowed to benefit from the same without harming their characters.

- Hemel Hempstead is the correct place to focus growth as it has good transport links. Allowing significant growth at Berkhamsted or Tring would negatively affect their character, the Chilterns AONB and the Green Belt.
- Berkhamsted should accommodate some new housing and economic growth as it is a town too.
- An alternative view is that the level of development in Berkhamsted should be strictly controlled: it should not alter the character of town.

Comments from landowners:

- Housing and economic growth should be directed towards Hemel Hempstead as it is the main town: this approach complements the sequential approach.
- Economic and housing provision need to be co-ordinated and a flexible supply of residential and employment uses maintained.
- Growth focussed at Hemel Hempstead should be primarily located where there are good public transport links.
- Hemel Hempstead, as a New Town, is well designed to growth with the addition of new neighbourhoods.
- The future housing requirement is likely to justify at least one strategic urban extension. New housing should be focussed at Hemel Hempstead.
Development within market towns and large villages should be restricted to within the existing urban area, while development in the countryside should not be allowed (with the exception of strategic extensions to Hemel Hempstead).
- Redevelopment of the Maylands area is supported, but should include the provision of facilities, services and housing.
- The strategy directs new housing to the towns and larger villages, but there is a need for new housing in the smaller villages too. The policy should be clearer in support for appropriate residential development in small and rural villages.
- The amount of development at Hemel Hempstead (the main location for growth) should be increased to meet existing and future housing needs.
- There should not be an absolute restriction on growth

within market towns and large villages.

- The two market towns [Berkhamsted and Tring] have a greater role to play than the large villages in meeting the Borough's housing targets.
- The market towns have a fundamental role in meeting the borough's future housing growth. The strengthening of the roles of the market towns should be apportioned to their status in the settlement hierarchy. An objection is raised to the approach of restricting building and population growth at the market towns and large villages, which should not be defined in the same category in terms of accommodating future development. Berkhamsted is considered an appropriate location for a sustainable urban extension which would enhance its status and complement growth at Hemel Hempstead. Growth at Berkhamsted would represent good planning because it would be sustainable development which complements growth at Hemel Hempstead whilst enhancing unique aspects of Berkhamsted town. It would create opportunities for new and existing communities with a sense of identity and place. Growth at Berkhamsted could be sustained by existing and potentially new social and transportation infrastructure.
- Policy SS4 of the East of England Plan emphasises the importance of providing additional development in key service centres with good levels of services. Kings Langley meets the criteria of a 'key service centre' and therefore should be permitted to expand, not restricted. PPS3 aims to ensure that people can have the opportunity to live in a decent home, in a community they want to live in. The proposed development strategy only promotes the expansion of Hemel Hempstead, where not everyone will want to live.

QUESTION 4

Should we keep the existing policy which strictly limits infilling in the Green Belt villages?

Responses received	236		
Yes - Key organisations	17	No clear answer –	
Individuals	174	Key organisations	1
Landowners	6	Individuals	0
Total	197	Landowners	0
responses		Total	1 response
No - Key organisations	4		
Individuals	30		
Landowners	4		
Total	38 responses		

Response	Actions
<p>The vast majority agreed (although opinion among landowners differed).</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council believe that gardens should not be regarded as brown field sites, and the Green Belt protected. • CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society supports the policy and would like to see it extended to small villages in the Rural Area. • Flaunden Parish Council believes that there are more areas that could be developed which do not take Green Belt land. • Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats would like the Council to consider exceptional sites to allow affordable homes strictly for local residents. • The Senior Ecologist at Herts Biological Records Centre would like Tring Rural to be designated as Green Belt. • Markyate Care Group believe that infilling will result in more traffic in Markyate and changes to the primary school. • Berkhamsted Town Council thinks there should be infilling policies for Berkhamsted to encompass both 	<p>Take the policy forward for limiting infill in the Green Belt villages.</p>

conservation and peripheral areas.

Comments from individuals:

People who agreed made the following comments/caveats:

- Green Belt use should be a last resort.
- There should be sufficient infrastructure and facilities to support infilling.
- Development should not damage the views of existing residents.

People who disagreed made the following comments/caveats:

- The Council should listen to local opinion to see if there is a valid exception, whilst maintaining the beauty of the villages.
- An affordable housing scheme may be more viable if it came forward as a block of twelve units, given the lifetime of the plan and the density required.
- There are some locations that could accommodate small scale development, which would not prejudice the environment: these should be considered by the Council.
- The policy should recognise the important role additional housing can help fulfil by sustaining local shops, services and facilities. A more flexible approach should be applied to the assessment of new housing proposals, where they are well related to existing village shops and services, and will not cause harm to the prevailing local character. A proportion should be kept for occupation by those with a historic connection with the village.
- It is important to have social housing for local need.
- Exceptions should be justified on a case by case basis.
- Piccotts End should be added to the list of Green Belt villages.
- There should be no building in peoples' gardens.
- There is a need for a more common sense review of the Green Belt, particularly when change is a constant occurrence.
- Green Belt should be protected as a priority.

Comments from landowners:

- There is a shortage of both private and affordable dwellings in Bourne End and little opportunity for development. In the absence of new dwellings many families have moved away. If sustainable communities are to be provided in line with PPS1 and PPS3, then the only way of achieving this is through some limited development in the Green Belt.
- The existing approach should be amended to reflect the current approach in the Rural Area.
- There may be derelict or vacant sites which may benefit from redevelopment.
- Development in the Green Belt should be limited to the most sustainable areas, where a sustainable quantum of development can be provided rather than piecemeal development.
- Para 1.5 in PPG2 [the purposes for including land in the Green Belt] should be adhered to.

QUESTION 5

Do you agree with the sequential approach to development that is outlined?

Responses received	213
Yes - Key organisations	21
Individuals	128
Landowners	10
Total	159 responses
No - Key organisations	0
Individuals	48
Landowners	6
Total	54 responses

Response

Actions

A substantial majority agreed.

Take forward the sequential approach to

Comments from key organisations:

Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust:

- Each biodiversity site needs to be treated on its merits and judged against appropriate environmental criteria. Brownfield sites can be very important in terms of the species they support. PPS9 stresses the need to retain such interest or to incorporate it into any development of the site.

Herts Biological Records Centre:

- Some previously developed sites may have acquired a local biodiversity interest and can thus contribute to the quality of the urban environment. This should also be a consideration when assessing sites for development.

The Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council:

- No development should take place on greenfield sites without proven exceptional circumstances. The fact that it is cheaper to build on such land is not a factor to be considered.

Natural England:

- Previously developed land may have considerable biodiversity value and contribute towards local greenspace accessibility targets. A case-by-case approach is needed, and local discussions on releasing Green Belt land for development should not be ruled out.

Berkhamsted Town Council agrees with the approach subject to the recommended density levels and the adequacy of infrastructure.

Hertfordshire County Council Passenger Transport Unit:

- Using previously developed land and locating larger development within more accessible areas make best use of the existing passenger transport network. There would be opportunities to increase its use and secure developer contributions to mitigate the impact of new development.

British Waterways agree with the principle, but there should be some flexibility. For instance, marinas are needed but they cannot be built in or very close to towns because of the economics of land values. Marina users do not need or

development.

Emphasise the need to optimise the effective use of land within settlements.

want to be very close to a full range of facilities and there are limited choices for sites along the canal.

The Highways Agency:

- Concentrating development at Hemel Hempstead is a sensible approach to the spatial distribution of housing and employment. New development needs to be accompanied by enhancements to public transport, improving connections between settlements.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:

- Brownfield sites within urban areas must be given precedence over development of greenfield land.

The Environment Agency:

- Development on brownfield sites should facilitate the remediation of previously contaminated sites. Flood risk should be considered in line with PPS25.

The Hemel Hempstead GM Action Group and Kings Langley Bio-Dynamic Group support the policy, but suggest the need for some flexibility.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer supports the approach, although this is partly dependent on the scale of the development, as a new neighbourhood may be sustainable.

Comments from individuals:

Those who disagreed made the following comments:

- The approach implies open land, farm land and the Green Belt could be developed.
- Green Belt land should not be developed.
- Only brownfield sites should be considered.
- There needs to be a better balance of new development across all parts of the borough to avoid overdevelopment in specific locations.
- Larger, more intensive development should not be directed to town centres. This will mean more people travelling to town centres by car thus creating additional congestion.
- Local communities should be provided with more

facilities so that they do not need to travel.

- The approach does not take into account the needs and practicalities of the existing population.
- There is insufficient reality about the lack of infrastructure funding.
- There are already too many homes and development proposed.
- The borough is already burdened by poor utilities and services, and congestion. Proper plans need to be made for schools and traffic.
- The expansion of existing commercial sites in the countryside should be avoided.
- The approach does not enhance or respect local character.

- The boundary of the Chilterns AONB should be reviewed taking into account the views of local residents.

- The approach suggests rapid population growth for Berkhamsted. This will strain existing resources and damage the character and social profile of Berkhamsted.
- Shootersway / Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted cannot support new development as it is already congested.
- There should be no extra housing around Tring.

Those who agreed made the following comments:

- Previously developed land should be used before greenfield land.
- The sequential approach to development should be framed so as to promote a range of housing in rural as well as urban areas.

- The infrastructure of town centres and other locations must be able to accommodate the increased development.
- Town centres should not accommodate more development, as this would encourage more commuting and congestion. Development should be directed towards local communities where facilities already exist.

- The town centre cannot support more development as it does not have sufficient facilities e.g. parking.
- The approach will lead to further high density development.
- There is a lack of infrastructure to support new development such as an acute hospital in Hemel Hempstead, sufficient school places and employment.
- Hemel Hempstead should remain a small town in the countryside.

Comments from landowners:

- The Maylands Business Area should be identified as a suitable location for more intensive forms of development in advance of out of centre and less accessible locations.
- There should be a recognition that new development can also improve the accessibility of certain areas, for instance through improvements to public transport infrastructure.
- PPS 3 states that housing should make effective use of land, existing infrastructure and available public and private investment. The RSS emphasises maximizing sustainable housing capacity of previously developed land and limited greenfield development in response to strong market demand and acute affordability problems. They support development on previously developed land, before using greenfield sites. However, this should not be done to the detriment of sustainability requirements or indeed the delivery of housing.
- The policy should include an appropriate level of flexibility. There are likely to be greenfield sites adjacent to settlement boundaries (e.g. Aldbury), which if developed for housing would prove highly sustainable in terms of accessibility to village facilities and public transport. A mixture of both brown and greenfield sites will be required to be delivered for housing to achieve a balanced portfolio of dwelling types.
- There will be instances where greenfield sites will be the most sustainable development option. They should not be prevented from coming forward.
- The approach should not extend to the testing of

<p>individual development schemes. This is no longer supported by national policy or regional policy. PDL should comprise one of a range of opportunities alongside, for example, urban extensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and greenfield land should be recognised as a valuable source of future housing supply in circumstances where there is a demonstrable housing need. • There is a need to plan to maintain land supply even if brownfield sites are not being delivered. • There is a need to plan for the creation of mixed use areas within towns and not just in town centres. • New development should be focused on brownfield sites within Hemel Hempstead rather than on greenfield sites in smaller settlements and the surrounding area. Development should be in accessible locations, but each site should be judged on its merits regardless of whether it is or is not located within a town centre. The Sappi Graphics and Red Lion sites in Nash Mills should be developed for housing. • Hemel Hempstead is at the top of the sequential hierarchy and, in line with the development strategy, is where development should thus be concentrated. • Previously developed land should be brought into use for housing, especially where it is well located to public transport, has been vacant for a long time, and its development would add cohesiveness to local communities. 	
--	--

QUESTION 6

Do you support the approach to achieving high quality urban design that is outlined?			
Responses received	222		
Yes - Key organisations	20	No clear answer -	
Individuals	147	Key organisations	1
Landowners	10	Individuals	2
Total	177 responses	Landowners	0
		Total	3 responses

<p>No - Key organisations 5 Individuals 36 Landowners 1 Total 42 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The substantial majority support the approach.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>EEDA supports the approach made and the intention to bring forward detailed Urban Design Assessments as supplementary planning documents for the towns and large villages. This approach should also be considered for Maylands Business Park in consultation with Inspire East and CABE.</p> <p>The Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach to urban design should be altered to include sustainable drainage systems. <p>The Planning Officer for Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council are concerned that medium to large scale developments, like Stag Lane in Berkhamsted and Kodak tower site, are not providing additional leisure space for children.</p> <p>Dacorum Environmental Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should consider building flats over car parks. <p>Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term 'Land-use' is too broad. High densities will provoke the need for allotment space and public space to compensate and greater amounts of hard-surfacing will increase run-off during heavy rainfalls. Policy is needed to ameliorate these effects. <p>Hertfordshire Police objects to the approach because urban design should address crime prevention and community safety, which are not mentioned.</p> <p>It was also pointed out that the Urban Design Assessments may need to be updated to reflect changes in development growth across the Borough.</p> <p>Comments from individuals:</p>	<p>Take forward the approach set out to achieve high quality design.</p> <p>Update the Urban Design Assessments to provide a consistent approach to the assessments for each of the places.</p>

People who agreed made the following comments/caveats:

- The principles in Policy 11 [in the existing Local Plan] should be taken forward.
- High quality development must ensure improved traffic flows through areas.
- The design and layout of a development should be appropriate to the surrounding environment and the development should add value to the surrounding open space.
- There are errors in the urban design assessment for Markyate. These should not be embedded in future policy. Gardens of listed buildings should not be suggested for development.
- Urban design considerations should take account of impact on existing community and infrastructure.
- More attention and focus should be afforded to the provision of off-street parking. Currently the high volume of cars parked on verges and pavements detracts from the quality of our towns and villages.
- There is a need for a greater diversity of design to accommodate a broader social group.
- There should be a system in place to measure whether comprehensive proposals have been delivered and what the impact will be to local communities.
- The following objective should be included. All new housing will seek a minimal environmental impact, and cycle routes should be built to serve large developments.
- Urban design considerations should take account of impact on existing community and infrastructure.

People who disagreed made the following comments/caveats:

- Development should be of a smaller scale.
- High density housing is not supported.
- Cramming more houses in can never achieve high quality development.
- Accurately scaled models of new developments should be made available for public viewing.
- There should be no encroachment on the Green Belt.

- The proposed level of development in Berkhamsted would adversely prejudice the Council's ability to meet the aims listed under 'Local Character'.
- Berkhamsted is already a vibrant market town and should not be overdeveloped.
- There should be no further development along Shootersway and Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted. Traffic in Shootersway is already congested and more traffic will only exacerbate the problem.
- Recent experience in Berkhamsted, with Stag Lane as an example, is that 'high quality' development is not accepted as high quality by the residents of Berkhamsted. More and better control over the quality and scaling of new buildings should be exercised and prioritised above the achievement of housing targets.
- Berkhamsted town centre cannot take any more development without destroying its character and reducing the quality of services and facilities.

Comments from landowners:

- Core Strategy policies should not include/repeat guidance set out in PPS1 and 3. Detailed considerations should be in a subsequent DPD.
- The need for good urban design should be moderated to ensure that development is viable and too much pressure is not placed on the developer. Site constraints and viability issues may govern the design of the site.
- Reference to the Urban Design Compendium should also be made as good practice.
- Any requirements must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate site specific considerations and ensure that development is achievable and deliverable across the Plan period.
- Individual site constraints should also be an appropriate consideration and there should be reference to public transport accessibility and improvements.
- Section 2, Local Character, should also include the heading massing, and Section 5, Quality of the Public Realm, should include security.

QUESTION 7

Is there anything in addition to the items listed that we should be considering in our response to Climate Change?

Responses received	204
Yes - Key organisations	19
Individuals	86
Landowners	7
Total	112 responses
No - Key organisations	3
Individuals	86
Landowners	3
Total	92 responses

Response	Actions
<p>A majority have put forward items for consideration (whether or not they were presented in the emerging core strategy paper).</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Chiltern Society and Chipperfield Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy should encourage renewable energy sources. <p>The Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More attention should be given to water supply, which is already stretched to breaking point in the Chilterns. Water is scarce and needs to be conserved to prevent rivers from drying up. All paving areas should be permeable to ensure rainwater goes to the chalk aquifer and is not lost in the main drainage system. <p>Chilterns Conservation Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development should seek to minimise or reduce flood risk. 	<p>Follow existing approach to Climate Change and consider incorporating best practice produced by the Planning Officers' Society and Planning Advisory Service.</p> <p>Consider the importance of farming and food production.</p> <p>Gather further technical evidence to support renewable energy targets, renewable energy generation and the reduction of carbon emissions.</p>

The Homes and Communities Agency would be happy to work with us to help strengthen the response to climate change.

The Environment Agency believes we also need to address flood risk in areas of new development, protect and enhance the landscape and biodiversity, and remediate contaminated land by encouraging its redevelopment.

Hemel Hempstead GM Action Group supports our response to climate change. Priority should be given to the development of farming and food production, and the reduction of the use of fossil fuels and our carbon footprint.

Herts County Council (Transport):

- The policy should encourage the use of more sustainable fuels, low emissions fuels and more efficient vehicles.

British Waterways supports the principles of the Herts Building Futures Guide. Sustainable forms of development should embrace transport and movement, in particular connectivity within and outside all development. Better links to the canal and towpath (and with better signage) should be encouraged.

Manor Estates Residents' Association:

- There should be specific requirements for the use of solar panels and ground source heat pumps.

Dacorum Environmental Forum seek a more active programme of promoting the use of renewable energy is required, such as solar power, thermal geo-power, combined heat and power and tree planting.

Berkhamsted Town Council:

- The core strategy should include policies to promote tree planting and minimise hard [ground] surfaces.

Tring Rural Parish Council would like the Council to extend the range of items which can be recycled.

Thames Water suggests we consider the use of an Energy Services Company and site-wide Combined Heat and Power within our policy approach. It comments that PPS1 recommends local authorities consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon energy sources and supporting infrastructure.

The Council's Sustainability Officer wants the core strategy:

- to set measures to help reduce carbon emissions in existing dwellings; and
- to follow (or exceed) the minimum levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes, i.e. Level 4 from 2010-2013, Level 5 from 2013-2016, and Level 6 from 2016 onwards.

The leader of Transition Town Berkhamsted would like all civic buildings to be built to BREEAM excellent standard. The leader also believes that we should commit to identifying suitable areas for the generation of renewable energy and low carbon energy sources.

BWEA strongly recommends that the Council has an overarching climate change policy in the Core Strategy and specific policies in the Development Control DPD, i.e. energy efficiency, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction.

Herts Biological Records Centre recommends a policy to support the production of local food and the preservation of existing farms, allotments and orchards. These growing areas are vital for biodiversity and local food security and more important with concerns around peak oil increasing food prices.

Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats are concerned that the principles are weak and would like the Council to explain what is meant by minimising impacts.

Herts County Council consider that all developments should have adequate water supplies necessary for hydrants, and if necessary, fire cover.

Comments from individuals:

Commenters offer the following suggestions:

- Reduce private car usage and minimise distance cars have to travel to motorways, by placing new development near major roads or near good transport links.
- Plant more trees in new developments and allow for trees to mature.
- Preserve existing trees and woodlands and protect gardens and allotments from development.
- Avoid more, hard surfacing.

- Improve footpaths and pavements, and provide extra cycle lanes in the towns and surrounding areas.
- Use sustainable materials: also consider permitting buildings in areas where development is normally restricted, if the design delivers a high level of sustainability.
- Provide more allotment sites to encourage people to grow their own food, especially as new homes have very small gardens.
- Promote the adoption of smart meter technology in new and existing developments.
- Insist on sustainable design for all new houses and work places.
- Promote good quality internet access to reduce the need to travel.
- Conserve the countryside (and Green Belt), landscape and open space, as a priority over the generation of renewable and low carbon energy, if it would detract from them.
- Identify suitable sites for renewable energy generation in the Borough.
- Encourage the use of public transport and road planning for priority bus routes.
- Develop a more user friendly public transport service to connect all villages with main points of use like shops and hospitals.
- Reduce the price of bus fares to encourage their use.
- Do not build or store toxic materials on floodplains.
- Draft a policy on the development of wind farms and installation of domestic wind turbines.
- Give help to householders to make their homes greener.
- Stop water leakages promptly.
- Reduce driving speeds to 20mph in residential areas.
- Do not use wood in construction externally above two or three storeys (because it requires expensive maintenance).
- Improve drainage systems.
- Improve the accessibility of household waste and recycling centres, particularly for the disabled.
- Support local shops/businesses for local people.
- Protect farms and fields to help with the world food

shortage.

- Reduce dumping and fly tipping.
- Avoid overdevelopment in order to prevent increasing levels of traffic congestion and pollution.
- Do not encourage more car journeys.
- Reduce population densities.

One contradictory view is that climate change is a global issue and there is nothing that the Council can do to make a difference.

Other general observations were as follows:

- Measurable objectives should be set to make them more meaningful.
- The Council should be taking the lead for others to follow.

Comments from landowners:

- Climate change policy should provide clear and concise objectives which should be consistent with the mandatory targets set by Government.
- Bringing forward mixed use development should be prioritised in order to deliver sustainable communities.
- Any requirements must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate site specific circumstances and any relevant technological advances and subsequent policy revisions.
- The Council should lead by example by encouraging sustainable travel and improving the sustainable credentials of offices and property and to ensure improvements are made to public transport.
- The Council should consider the constrained land around the [Buncefield] oil terminal for an energy centre or photovoltaic park. The energy centre could be used to provide battery power for public buses serving the area.
- There should be flexibility in the application of sustainability measures to take account of site costs and constraints.
- There should be a greater emphasis on existing development reducing carbon emissions.

QUESTION 8

Do you agree with the approach that is outlined to Accessibility of Facilities?	
Responses received	214
Yes - Key organisations	13
Individuals	143
Landowners	9
Total	165 responses
No - Key organisations	1
Individuals	46
Landowners	2
Total	49 responses
Response	Actions
<p>The substantial majority support the approach.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council (Transport):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An effective road hierarchy, ensuring the free flow of traffic, is important as it enables the efficient running of bus services. The benefits of new capacity should be locked in by improving pedestrian/cycle access and bus infrastructure/priority. • Reference is made to the need for new roads giving the ‘opportunity to resolve existing problems’. This statement needs clarifying. Key to the accessibility of new neighbourhoods is the quality of pedestrian/cycle routes and accessibility to bus services. If new roads are built, they should be designed so as to be conducive to bus operation within the new neighbourhoods and discourage rat-running. Improvements to passenger transport infrastructure, walking/cycling routes need to be balanced with encouraging the use of these sustainable modes. • The importance of parking policies is mentioned. At the moment it is relatively easy and cheap to park in the town centre. The availability and ease to which people can park their cars influences their choice of means of 	<p>Take approach forward for Accessibility of Facilities.</p> <p>Refer to the co-ordination of transport infrastructure with the organisations that have transport responsibilities. This will involve partnership working with HCC, the Highways Agency, Network Rail, bus and train operators and London Luton Airport Consultative Committee.</p>

travel. Also important is a routing strategy so through traffic avoids the town centre and bus priority measures are improved to ensure the efficient running of bus services.

- The location of new services and facilities close to accessible locations is supported by the Passenger Transport Unit but the order in which the different modes are listed should begin with pedestrians, followed by cyclists, passenger transport, and then car and with equal access for the disabled.
- Enhanced service provision within neighbourhood centres is positive. It is important that such centres are accessible by a variety of different modes of transport. It is likely that they will not be large enough to sustain the range of services available in the town centre so links by sustainable modes are important.
- The design of new developments should also be so as to be conducive for bus operation – i.e. location of bus stops within reasonable walking distance, road widths/layout, pedestrian/cycle accessibility and quality of routes.
- Factors that should be considered when site accessibility is considered in more detail include the effective location of bus stops, the provision of high quality infrastructure - bus shelters, DDA compliant stops, signage and adequate information is provided. Important to implementation is liaison with relevant transport providers and parking enforcement.

British Waterways:

- There needs to be flexibility because the canal is a fixed asset. It is sometimes difficult to locate new canal-related development close to a wide range of services and facilities.

Highways Agency:

- The majority of development is concentrated around the largest urban area (Hemel Hempstead) making use of existing infrastructure and improving access to jobs, retail and other facilities. At a broad level, this is considered a sensible approach in terms of the spatial distribution of housing and employment.
- We note that additional housing is allocated to some of

the smaller villages to maintain existing population levels. Whilst we consider this a reasonable approach there is some concern that residents will not have the same access to jobs, retail and other facilities compared to larger urban areas such as Hemel Hempstead and they may need to travel further afield, potentially by car. It is important that development proposals are accompanied by enhancements to public transport infrastructure, improving connections between these more rural areas and major urban centres such as Hemel Hempstead.

- The majority of employment development is concentrated within Maylands and the town centre. It is noted that some residential development is allocated here. This is a sensible proposal which improves access to jobs and will reduce travel distances to work.
- Based on the information put forward in the Core Strategy, we support the development proposals. However, it is recognised that the full ramifications of the RSS review and the potential allocation of additional housing in the Green Belt will need to be appraised once they emerge.
- We also acknowledge that the County Council is preparing a traffic model. The scope of this project is unclear, particularly whether or not it includes M1 junctions 7 and 8 and whether it incorporates development aspirations put forward in the Emerging Core Strategy. It is also unclear whether traffic modelling has been undertaken borough wide.

The Homes and Communities Agency supports the promotion of sustainable modes of transport.

Natural History Museum :

- The strategy should acknowledge the need for additional parking near the museum.

The Ramblers Association:

- Access to the countryside should be improved and contributions should be sought from developments to deliver this. Extending the footpath network should also be improved.
- The needs of pedestrians should be a high priority.

Tring Rural Parish Council:

- Parking policies should differ in urban and rural areas.

Dacorum Environmental Forum:

- The Council should adopt a sequential approach (hierarchy) for access modes, with walking being at the top.

The Primary Care Trust:

- Policies should prioritise pedestrians and cyclists, and development designed and located to support them.

Comments from individuals:

People who agreed but made the following points:

- The needs of elderly people should be met.
- New large scale development should make sure that it has adequate parking for private cars because public transport is not adequate.
- Sewerage systems need improving.
- Air quality needs to be considered when looking at transport options.
- Existing public transport network needs investment, particularly from the town centre, train station and Maylands.
- A lower parking standard should be adopted for the town centre and other mixed use areas.
- All new development, regardless of size, should contribute to public transport.
- There also needs to be better maintenance of existing roads.

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- If parking is restricted then there will be more congestion on our already over crowded and poorly maintained roads.
- The Council has to understand that the private car is a way of life and restricting parking at home, work or in the town centres will not reduce car use. There needs to be underlying social change.
- There needs to be a detailed transport strategy which is fully integrated into the Council's development plans.

We cannot have more housing without this detailed look at existing passenger transport.

- This strategy does not do enough to tackle congestion. It fails to fully recognise the congestion that is caused by new development and it certainly does not have a comprehensive investment plan to tackle this.

Comments from landowners:

- The overall policy objectives are supported and it is agreed that development should be guided to locations which can provide access to facilities. The text lacks clarity at the moment. It states that facilities should be accessible by car but then adds that they should avoid inappropriate levels of traffic on unsuitable roads. It is unclear whether the approach is to encourage more local provision of facilities to serve the immediate residents whereby cars are not needed, or to locate facilities in locations which are accessible to more people by a range of transport modes.
- More emphasis needs to be placed on locating development nearer the urban area, particularly close to public transport nodes. Locating development in peripheral locations should be avoided.
- Guidance should be strengthened so to support higher density development in areas where there is a good access to facilities and transport nodes.
- New neighbourhoods over 1,500 dwellings can provide a range of new facilities for the surrounding area. Providing facilities in this way means that local needs can be served.
- Parking provision needs to be reduced, particularly in the town centre.
- Maylands has poor parking provision. It is unrealistic to constrain parking here until adequate public transport provision is made available. Accessibility to Maylands by car is the life blood.
- New development offers the opportunity to improve infrastructure provision.
- The Council should be tougher on parking in the town.
- The capacity of services should be considered.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any observations on the housing programme and future housing policy that is outlined?

Responses received	239
Yes - Key organisations	20
Individuals	129
Landowners	16
Total	165 responses
No - Key organisations	5
Individuals	63
Landowners	6
Total	74 responses

Response	Actions
<p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability Officer and the Dacorum Environmental Forum support the revised lower housing figure as it reduces the threat to the Green Belt. If sustainability is to be taken seriously, the lower target is unsustainable beyond 2031.</p> <p>The Jehovah's Witnesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is vital to include sufficient community sites (D1 use class) to cater for the expansion of development in the Borough. <p>The Chiltern Society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The figures for housing need are speculative as they are dependent on the health of the economy. Employment growth is vital and should take precedence over housing. <p>Dacorum Environmental Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future housing should be concentrated on brownfield sites, such as Bovingdon Airfield and land around the Maylands Avenue business estate. The western side of Hemel Hempstead is adjacent to the Chilterns Hills and AONB. 	<p>Take forward alternative growth levels for further consultation. Include allocations at Hemel Hempstead within one alternative.</p> <p>Liaise with Infrastructure providers to bottom out requirements concerning different growth options.</p>

Manor Estate Resident's Association:

- Current levels of parking provision are insufficient in new development. While it is necessary to reduce car use, it is not necessary to expect a reduction in car ownership.

Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats:

- The Council is not planning for an adequate supply of affordable housing. An appropriate mix of housing provision will help employers in their recruitment difficulties, especially retaining key workers.

West Hertfordshire Primary Care Trust:

- GP practices in Dacorum have less space restrictions overall than elsewhere in Hertfordshire. They are potentially able to service an increase in population. However this capacity is not necessarily sufficient to match major residential expansion around Hemel Hempstead. This needs to be addressed in the PCT's estate plan, including whether sites for new health development are required.

Berkhamsted Town Council:

- Windfall sites should be carefully monitored. Strong local policies are required to prevent the negative effects of windfall.

Hertfordshire Police Authority:

- The housing programme fails to recognise the need to deliver housing in a sustainable manner. The Core Strategy fails to recognise the requirements of Policies SS1 and SS2 of the East of England Plan to create and deliver sustainable development. The housing programme fails to recognise the level of infrastructure required to support future growth.

Hertfordshire County Council (Forward Planning):

- It would be helpful if any further iterations of the core strategy clearly set out the rationale for choosing the annual housing rate (from the Local Plan) and the 2031 timeframe, particularly in the context of the RSS Review.

Hertfordshire County Council Passenger Transport Unit:

- There is a significant difference between 9,000 and 17,000 houses in terms of planning for infrastructure, including passenger transport, pedestrian and cycle links.

Highways Agency:

Concentrating development around Hemel Hempstead is a sensible approach to the spatial distribution of housing and employment. The full issue will need to be appraised once these development targets are clear. If additional housing was allocated away from Hemel Hempstead, residents would not be afforded the same level of access to jobs, retail and other facilities, potentially increasing car journeys. New development needs to be accompanied by enhancements to public transport improving connections between the settlements.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:

- The need for a greenfield land reserve to ensure the housing target is met is reluctantly accepted. However, there must be some form of phasing in order to achieve the sequential approach.
- The Council to adopt a target of 40% of new dwellings to be affordable.

Homes and Communities Agency recommends waiting for further clarity in the regional housing allocation.

Three Rivers District Council:

- The inclusion of a windfall allowance for years 6-10 is supported. There is no obvious reason why these sites will not continue in the future and their absence would give a false impression of housing supply in the Borough.

Chipperfield Parish Council:

- The Government are unlikely to be satisfied with a housing target of 9,000 new homes.

Comments from individuals:

A number of comments oppose development in particular locations:

(a) within settlements;

- at Adeyfield and Grovehill,
- in Berkhamsted (including off Durrants Lane)

- sites identified in Markyate in the housing land availability assessment (If this is typical of sites elsewhere, then they should be vetted very carefully before choosing them for development sites.

(b) within the Green Belt;

- at Marchmont Farm and Shendish; and
- at Shootersway.

The reasons relate to infrastructure needs and impact of development.

One commenter takes an opposite view. There are many areas in the Green Belt that are of little use and of no scenic value which could be sensibly used for development

General opposition to new development focuses on the effect of higher density, including the provision of more flats (rather than family homes), loss or change in the character of an area, traffic and parking congestion and the perceived lack of infrastructure.

Some comments express concern about the problem of accommodating any new development:

- There are predicted water shortages – hence the need to minimise water use and promote water conservation and use of grey water.
- The region is already overcrowded and the infrastructure is inadequate. New development should go elsewhere in the county. Market forces should be allowed to allocate resources and public sector employment moved out of the region.

There are also general comments favouring the use of brownfield land and objecting to the use of the Green Belt (including as a contingency).

There is a range of comments on the character and quality of new development:

- Large new areas of housing will lack social cohesion and a sense of place.
- There are too many flats in the borough with too little parking, local shops or school places.
- New housing needs to be of higher design quality and space standards.
- New build houses should include a range of sustainability measures.

- New housing must be matched by new infrastructure, services and facilities.
- All forms of developments need to meet higher design quality and sustainability levels. Affordable housing should be built to a similar standard.
- The priority should be for smaller (no more than 20 dwellings) rather than larger development (240 or more houses).

Comments on the level of housing vary:

- A target of 9,000 homes to 2031 is realistic.
- The Council should continue to oppose any target for high levels of housing in the Plan: the result of the judicial review of the housing figures in the East of England Plan is supported.
- Building 9,000 new houses will not necessarily benefit Dacorum residents in the future in terms of improving family welfare, the local economy and the environment.
- 6,500 new homes [in Hemel Hempstead] is opposed.
- The housing programme is flawed, the research is dated and inaccurate, and does not reflect the impact of the current recession.
- The Council is not able to ensure the delivery of the housing programme, particularly as a consequence of the current economic downturn.
- No evidence is presented that the level of housing caters for local housing need (that is arising from the existing population). Local population growth is the key to delivering a sustainable community. The SHMA and DES need to take a community focussed approach when considering what constitutes a sustainable community.

One comment says that the housing programme needs to be flexible to respond to demographic changes and thus provide for a range of housing types.

There are various comments on affordable housing,

- Further residential development should focus on affordable housing.
- More (social) housing is needed in Hemel Hempstead and this should be prioritised for existing residents.
- Social rented housing should be maximised in accessible locations.

- The delivery of 39% affordable housing must be assessed. Other [developer] contributions may need to be sacrificed in order to make schemes viable with that level of affordable housing.

There is a series of comments about Hemel Hempstead:

- The land between the M1, Maylands Avenue and Leverstock Green should be identified for housing.
- Vacant land and properties in the Maylands business area should be used for housing.
- Most development should be concentrated in Hemel Hempstead which has better infrastructure and links to the motorway. This will preserve the character of the surrounding area and minimise the impact on the environment. It will also reduce travel distances, congestion and carbon dioxide emissions.
- However, Hemel Hempstead should not be allowed to expand so as to engulf other settlements and adversely affect their identity.
- Hemel Hempstead may be designated as a New Town, but this does not mean it has room for infinite expansion. It has a lack of facilities (e.g. closure of hospital, Pavilion, schools, scaling down of college, reduced police presence).

Comments from landowners:

- It is not appropriate to limit housing provision to a continuation of the Local Plan [360 dwellings p.a.]. This may provide the only quantifiable base-line, but the strategy should focus on exceeding this level as far as possible within current policy constraints in order to maximise housing growth at Hemel Hempstead. A proactive strategy is needed to make up for the underperformance of some key sites to-date (e.g. the Manor Estate site). The contribution from committed sites should be increased.
- The core strategy should plan for a higher level of housing of around 680 dwellings pa. A lower level of housing will not meet the needs of the community.
- Gypsy pitches, rural exceptions sites and windfalls should be excluded from the identified housing supply.
- There is no policy basis for a contingency of 5-10%.

- Another view is that there should be a contingency in excess of 10%.
- The difference between defined sites and defined locations in Hemel Hempstead requires further explanation. For example, there is concern over the deliverability of housing within Maylands.
- There is insufficient reference to new market housing.
- The results of the housing market assessment (SHMA) will be crucial in establishing the likely mix of dwellings that are required.
- There is a need for clear viability testing of any levels of affordable housing put forward in the Core strategy. There is also a need for careful consideration of other s.106 requirements on sites and a flexible approach to levels of affordable housing in different markets.
- The Council has not included any allowance for migration. It should be revisited and the housing numbers increased to avoid a significant shortage.
- A significant number of the sites identified in the housing programme may not be developed within the plan period. It cannot be assumed that all SHLAA sites will be delivered. The SHLAA was published before a number of key technical documents (Hertfordshire London Arc Employment Study (March 2009), the SHMA and the DES). It is also based on the UCS (January 2005).
- The housing programme should not include allowances for windfall in the first 10 years.
- The core strategy should examine opportunities for increasing provision from existing and other potential sources of housing supply. This could include amendments to the Green Belt boundary around Hemel Hempstead and elsewhere. Various opportunities are suggested:
 - at Shendish
 - at Marchmont Farm
 - at Pouchen End
 - at Red Lion Lane, Nash Mills
 - villages in the Green Belt such as Bourne End
 - at Tring
- Previously developed land should be brought into use first for housing. The Council should continue to support

<p>proposals for development on brownfield sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment of vacant or underused employment land for mixed use offers the opportunity to provide new housing and reduce pressure on the Green Belt. • Examples are proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sappi Graphics at Nash Mills - Waterhouse Square (with a capacity to deliver 900-1,150) - Maylands Gateway • Location of residential development should be compatible with standard development control criteria, including the advice of the HSE in relation to existing fuel storage facilities. • There needs to be flexibility with regards to the level of affordable housing to allow for site specific considerations. • The core strategy needs policies to meet the growing housing needs of the elderly. 	
--	--

QUESTION 10

Do you agree with the draft policy on Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers set out?	
Responses received	602
Yes - Key organisations -	8
Individuals	29
Landowners	1
Total	38 responses
No - Key organisations -	4
Individuals	555 (this includes 420* with the same comment – see below)
Landowners	5
Total	564 responses
Note: The views of the Gypsy and Traveller Community on this matter have been recorded and analysed separately: see the Gypsy and Traveller Consultation Report – September 2009 in Annex B	

Response	Actions
<p>The overwhelming majority of individuals and landowners disagreed.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council (Environment Department):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The East of England Plan contains a requirement for 20 additional pitches in the period 2006-2011. Applying the requirements of Policy H3 to provision beyond 2011 to 2031 indicates a requirement for 65 additional pitches between 2006 and 2031. <p>Berkhamsted Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New pitches, like affordable housing, should be linked to substantial new housing development. However, if Gypsy and Traveller sites are incorporated into new housing developments access to the sites will need to be carefully arranged. • Sites should not be allowed in the Chilterns AONB. <p>Friends, Families and Travellers and Traveller Law Reform Project welcome the inclusion of the policy but have some concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The estimate of pitch provision to 2013 does not align with likely future predictions. The RSS revised pitch allocations are 20 to 2011 with a further 9 pitches to 2016. Using the 3% compound rate for family formation as for the 2011-16 gives an estimate of 100 pitches to 2031. • Pitches are needed in a coordinated way but this should include the word ‘timely’ to ensure provision is provided when it is needed and not years later. • Equity is at the heart of Government policy: 25% of Travellers are currently homeless through lack of sites. • Integration is important rather than seeing two separate communities. There is of course only one, from which the travelling community has been excluded. • Although sustainability issues are important we recognise the difficulty in finding sustainable locations for Travellers. The approach should recognise these constraints and seek to balance deliverability and sustainability. Unless this is done, it will be very difficult to secure new sites. • Government guidance aims to promote more private site provision and the Council should reflect this. At the moment there is too much emphasis on public provision 	<p>Take policy approach forward. This is a controversial subject on which the Council should take a lead. The vast majority of the ‘no’ responses can be related to the possibility of Gypsies/Travellers living near the settled community and/or on a particular site. The draft policy was concluded after previous, extensive consultation and is based on principles of equity and integration.</p> <p>On request, HCC recalculated the pitch requirement and agreed with the Council’s estimate of additional pitches (i.e. 59).</p> <p>This duty has been fairly carried out. 8 responses to Question 10 have either been rejected as inappropriate (and therefore not counted) or have been edited to exclude inappropriate remarks.</p>

– for example giving priority to sites on land designated for strategic housing.

- Both public and private provision should be catered for in such a way that the needs of Gypsies and Travellers for a variety of tenures are provided in line with government guidance.
- There should be commitment to full and effective consultation with local Gypsy and Travellers. Without proactive outreach and development of an effective ongoing dialogue with the Gypsy and Traveller community, there is a risk that the strategy will fail and be found unsound.

Flaunden Parish Council:

- The policy is too vague. It should focus on the re-use of urban sites to facilitate access to education and healthcare.
- There should be no Green Belt development

Bucks and West Herts Gypsy Advocacy:

- The Council has a duty under the Race Relations Act 1976 (as amended by the Race Relations (Amendments) Act 2000) to actively seek to eliminate unlawful discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good race relations. The duty prohibits racial discrimination by local planning authorities in carrying out their planning functions.
- We advise that comments should not apply pressure to discriminate against any racial group; they should be directed to valid planning considerations.

Comments from individuals:

People who agreed but made the following points:

- But there needs to be better cross-organisational cooperation to integrate the two communities and not just simply providing new sites.
- However, the policy should be clearer on the type of land that will be used to provide sites.

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- * 420 identical responses were received from residents in Berkhamsted. It says the policy is fundamentally flawed. The needs of the Gypsies and Travellers can be better met by large purpose built sites rather than interspersed in a number of small sites in several locations. If Gypsy and Traveller sites are to be

incorporated in housing developments difficulties will be encountered with regard to access in and out for the Gypsies and Travellers' vehicles.

- Locating new sites around smaller villages will mean that there is a disproportionate impact on the existing communities.
- Local services (health and education) which are already under pressure are going to be faced with additional challenges.
- The Council's policy conflicts with Green Belt planning principles.
- It is difficult to see how fairness to the Gypsy and Traveller community and the existing community will be achieved.
- Sites should not be provided in strategic housing sites because major new developments are unlikely to have adequate provision of local services.
- Gypsy and Traveller needs can be better met on larger sites rather than on dispersed sites because it would be possible to pool resources and provide better facilities on one large site.
- Accommodation for natural growth in the local ethnic traveller community should be supported in existing locations, rather than trying to seed new communities where they have no historic root. This is particularly important because the infrastructure should already be in place.
- Access into housing sites would be difficult if sites were to be provided as part of strategic housing sites.
- The policy is vague: how can the council secure integration with a transient community?
- The Scott Wilson Report [on the location of sites for Gypsies and Travellers] is not comprehensive enough and fails to take into account a variety of other settlement specific issues such as the existing community. One day of research is simply not enough to inform policy.
- Locating sites so close to urban areas is likely to lead to friction between the two communities.
- New sites should not be placed in close proximity to existing sites.
- The peripheral zones of the town have very low density housing and accommodating Gypsies and Travellers in these locations contradicts your key principle in Table 1.
- Has anyone considered whether the Gypsy and Traveller community want to be integrated?

Comments from landowners:

- Sites now form part of the housing provision and therefore the same approach to sustainability needs to be taken. The policy states that it is important for good access to the M1 or A41. It would be unacceptable to state that new housing should have good access to the M1.
- How does the Council know how to deliver these pitches without knowing its own housing targets? The Council does not know how many strategic sites it needs, if any at all, and therefore does not know how it will deliver Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- There needs to be a definition of strategic sites.
- The Council should acknowledge that giving priority to the provision of pitches at strategic housing site locations is likely to significantly reduce the capacity of such sites to deliver their unit allocations based on expected land take of such pitches.
- Government guidance gives preference to brownfield, town centre locations to accommodate future Gypsy and Traveller sites would then be close to transport hubs and key services. On this basis, the reference to strategic housing sites should be excluded.
- An alternative view is that it would be inappropriate to locate a Gypsy and Traveller site in the town centre (Waterhouse Square could be defined as a strategic site).

QUESTION 11

Do you agree with the general approach outlined for community and leisure facilities?

Responses received	216
Yes - Key organisations	14
Individuals	160
Landowners	7
Total	181 responses
No - Key organisations	3
Individuals	29
Landowners	3

Total 35 responses	
Response	Actions
<p>The substantial majority agreed.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council (Transport):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of community facilities in accessible locations is very important as the potential for using sustainable modes of transport increases. It is essential to promote social inclusion and equality of opportunity and it is a key target within the Local Transport Plan. In relation to schools, the provision of school bus services and county level programmes such as School Travel Plans and Safer Routes to School help promote the use of sustainable modes of travel. These should be encouraged. • The location of health services has an impact on the effectiveness of health related community transport. <p>Hertfordshire County Council (Education):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Land designations currently apply to schools. It is essential for the approach to be amended to guide further development on school sites. School playing fields are protected under other controls. <p>The Box Moor Trust:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leisure and health are linked but this equally applies to promoting ‘active travel’ to all facilities and encouraging people to walk and cycle as part of their daily routine. • The statement, “Existing Open Spaces will be protected,” is too rigid. The following should be considered instead: ‘the overall quality and quantity of open space in the borough will not be diminished and every opportunity will be taken to add new spaces of diverse characters’. <p>Berkhamsted Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relocation of the main hospital to Watford illustrates some of the contradictions arising from the aim of encouraging walking and cycling when you do not have community and leisure facilities available locally. 	<p>Take principles forward. Inform through ongoing liaison with the education authority, Children, Schools and Families at Hertfordshire County Council, and partnerships responsible for health and leisure facilities.</p>

Tring Rural Parish Council:

- Dacorum and Aylesbury Vale Councils need to communicate more, because the cumulative impact of development in both areas is going to be great.

The Theatres Trust:

- Major development should include cultural facilities.
- There should be a glossary defining what facilities are included.

Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats:

- Nowhere is the shortage of open space addressed.

Comments from individuals:

People who agreed but made the following points:

- 'Cultural events and facilities' should be mentioned separately from leisure.
- At the moment schools across the borough are oversubscribed. This needs to be considered when planning more houses.
- We need more locations for cultural activities to take place in Hemel Hempstead.
- Community and leisure facilities are generally large scale and require a lot of land. Can these be easily directed to the most accessible locations which are in town centres?
- New housing growth should be met by adequate investment into healthcare and education.
- Open space must be protected from development. Providing more open should be a key priority.

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- The borough needs investment in top quality health and education facilities to make it thriving and dynamic as the vision hopes. We have seen closures in both recently.
- The policy fails to balance sustainability objectives with providing new facilities.
- You should be improving existing facilities through public sharing agreements. You should review existing provision and commit to requiring landowners to enter

into sharing agreements where appropriate. This would secure more investment.

Comments from landowners:

- The approach is unclear. What are the council's priorities?
- Access to sport and leisure facilities should be encouraged, whether public or private.
- In practice, the Council is proposing to redevelop the community hall on the corner of Stocks Road and Toms Hill Road in Aldbury, contrary to its own policy.

QUESTION 12

Do you agree with the approach to employment provision that is outlined?

Responses received 179

Yes - Key organisations 14
 Individuals 138
 Landowners 10
Total 162 responses

No clear answer:
 Key organisations 2
 Individuals 1
 Landowners 0
Total 3

No - Key organisations 1
 Individuals 9
 Landowners 4
Total 14 responses

Response

Actions

The overwhelming majority agreed.

Comments from key organisations:

The Dacorum Environmental Forum:

- Objective 3 should be re-presented in terms of carbon footprint reduction, for example by sustainable waste management and involvement in recycling, servicing and repair. This includes businesses that achieve or aspire to a good assessment under BS2050 (Assessment of the Carbon Footprint of Goods and

Take forward the approach to employment provision.

Ensure that the role of all parts of the Borough is covered.

Services) or some similar Life Cycle Analysis audit.

Berkhamsted and Northchurch Liberal Democrats:

- There should be a stronger emphasis on promoting the dispersal of employment so as to reduce reliance on cars or public transport to access employment.

Berkhamsted Town Council:

- Independent retailers and small business incubation units should be encouraged in the town.

Hertfordshire County Council Passenger Transport Unit supports the principle of reinforcing the three towns as employment locations, although there is no guarantee that a reduced need to travel would result. Where employment areas are developed, opportunities should be taken to enhance their accessibility by pedestrians, cyclists and bus services.

British Waterways agree with most of the key priorities, but wants greater emphasis on the quality of the environment and healthy living in attracting and maintaining employment. Employment sites in standalone rural locations should be discouraged unless it supports the rural economy or there are other special circumstances. Underused industrial sites near the canal could be redeveloped for a variety of uses if that offers a more attractive view of, and access to, the canal.

The Highways Agency:

- Concentrating development at Hemel Hempstead is a sensible approach to the spatial distribution of housing and employment. Some residential development is allocated around the Maylands business area and Hemel Hempstead town centre. This will help reduce travel distances if people have the opportunity to live and work in the same area. New development should be accompanied by enhancements to public transport.

The Homes and Communities Agency supports the regeneration of the Maylands area and the promotion of sustainable growth.

Comments from individuals:

Those who disagreed made the following comments:

- Employment is required in all areas of Dacorum. This needs to be done responsibly to avoid overdevelopment in specific locations. This will also reduce traffic congestion.
- It is essential to develop Maylands business area as a high quality commercial estate with good links to the motorway. Parking restrictions should not be imposed on the area.
- The proximity of the Buncefield depot will continue to detract from businesses from the Maylands estate. An alternative employment area should be created away from the depot, and the existing estate should be made into a wildlife reserve.
- The economic climate will dictate the approach to local employment provision.
- The technical work underpinning the approach is out of date.
- The objectives should also refer to achievements at school, college and university.
- New office space should not be built if it is not required.
- In trying to develop industrial areas in Berkhamsted, this will totally disregard the commuting nature of the town.

Those who agreed made the following comments:

- There are a high number of London commuters in the borough, and they need to be catered for as they bring money into the area.
- The region is overcrowded leading to the need for high levels of commuting. This has lowered the quality of life for residents. There should be a working principle in place that commercial development is restricted to activities which it can be demonstrated cannot be done anywhere else.
- The region is overdeveloped and its infrastructure is inadequate. Further growth should go to other parts of the country, including existing public sector employment, and then let market forces allocate resources.
- Insufficient employment opportunities exist. Building new homes will not improve the situation. If a new acute hospital was built in Hemel Hempstead this would offer

scope for additional local jobs.

- Whilst Hemel Hempstead and the Maylands development is the core of this strategy, it is vital to reduce the requirement to travel to encourage and support local businesses in the other towns.
- Effective use should be made of existing employment floorspace.
- Most of the demand will be for office accommodation. Hemel Hempstead is becoming unbalanced by the lack of manufacturing industry.
- Employment provision must be matched by the capacity of existing infrastructure.
- Objective 4 needs to cover attracting retail businesses to the Marlowes.
- Limiting the number of houses built will preserve the character of the market towns.
- Markyate needs to retain its longstanding industrial skills base in light engineering / precision engineering. It is an integral part of the village and helps it to remain more than a dormitory settlement.

Comments from landowners:

- GEAs need to be retained, but this should be flexible. Single use allocations are likely to restrict rather than encourage development in the borough.
- There should be flexibility over the mix and location of employment uses in the Borough.
- The priority for employment land should be Maylands. There is a need to acknowledge that there are other forms of employment outside of the B use classes (e.g. hotels, leisure, retail, and nursing homes) which may be acceptable in certain locations/developments.
- The regeneration of the Maylands area needs to include the wider eastern section of the town. Homes and jobs should be focused on the eastern side of Hemel Hempstead. There is a need for joint working with St Albans to plan for any employment development there. .
- Development must not compromise the future redevelopment of the Buncefield Oil depot. The objectives should refer to the importance the depot makes to the economy of the south east and to the UK.

- Any policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate site-specific considerations and changes in supply and demand, and the need in the market, based on up-to-date assessments. The Council should remain open to changes of use, including residential.
- The reuse of vacant brownfield land should be encouraged if is sustainable and results in a beneficial alternative use.
- Landowners suggest changes at:
 - Frogmore Industrial Estate (2.55 ha)
 - Apsley Mills
 - the National Grid site, London Road.
- The redevelopment of the Hicks Road GEA in Markyate would offer the opportunity to improve on-site employment provision and provide new housing and other services.
- The policy should also recognise that new sustainable communities have the ability to provide supporting employment uses to meet specific needs and requirements of a local area and the wider borough

QUESTION 13

Do you agree with the removal of the ceiling on the amount of office floorspace that can be provided in the Borough?

Responses received 190

Yes - Key organisations 11
 Individuals 117
 Landowners 9
Total 137 responses

No clear answer:
 Key organisations 0
 Individuals 1
 Landowners 0
Total 1

No - Key organisations 1
 Individuals 51
 Landowners 0
Total 52 responses

Response	Actions
<p>A substantial majority agreed.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ceiling may need to be revised, but one should be in place. <p>Comments from individuals:</p> <p><i>Those who agreed made the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ceiling can be removed providing there is still provision made for light industry. The Council should consider promoting home-working policies with local employers. The removal of the ceiling is acceptable providing it is matched by funding to bring employers into the area to occupy the new floorspace. The removal of the ceiling should go hand in hand with improved public transport. The demand for employment needs to be balanced with the available housing and road congestion/train congestion. Sustainability is more important than the imposition of any artificial ceiling. The demand for employment must be balanced with available housing and the ability of roads to cope with congestion. One contradictory comment said that more office and commercial floorspace should be discouraged, given the current recession. There is already a considerable amount of empty premises, which are unattractive and give a poor impression of the area. <p><i>Those who disagreed made the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing infrastructure cannot cope. There is a need for a flexible approach that allows conversion back to other uses if required. The ceiling achieves no real purpose. There are too many empty properties/offices in the 	<p>Remove floorspace ceiling.</p> <p>The recommendations of a technical study will help set a target for the long-term provision of office space.</p>

borough.

- The approach should remain until there is firm evidence of unmet demand.
- Empty office buildings are likely to prove unacceptable to residents.
- More control is required when the economy is buoyant.
- The balance between homes and offices is required to avoid “ghost buildings” outside office hours. This increases the chances of petty crime.
- There are insufficient details on the increase envisaged.
- It is more important to focus on training young people for productive jobs and encouraging more diversity in the job market.
- The ceiling amount should be reviewed in line with sustainable growth and industry type. Warehouses provide a poor office floorspace return for the number of jobs. Also, empty and derelict office blocks are not a strong selling point. Some areas should be considered for other uses such as housing and schools.
- The approach must not encourage skyscrapers.
- The current recession does not support more business premises in the short to medium term.
- There is a need to encourage new small and large businesses.
- The ceiling should be reconsidered after 2011 and must take account of long-term demand patterns and trends for office floorspace.
- Additional office floorspace is not needed as much of it is currently being removed or converted into housing.
- Berkhamsted cannot support additional commercial development as it is already overdeveloped, there is insufficient parking and the roads are congested.
- The area is already overdeveloped.
- The ceiling should only apply to Hemel Hempstead.
- Some form of control should be applied to measure actual floorspace provided under or over a reasonable limit. The removal of the ceiling should not be at the expense of uncontrolled growth.
- If internet access was improved throughout the countryside there would be less need for additional office floorspace as people could work from home.
- All buildings should be used first before removing the

<p>ceiling.</p> <p>Comments from landowners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is a target, it must be realistic. • Economic growth that is sustainable and meets the requirements and needs of the borough and sub-region is encouraged. Barriers to employment must be removed in order to improve access to local jobs and increase the range of employment opportunities. Therefore, the ceiling on office or any other employment floorspace should be deleted. 	
---	--

QUESTION 14

Do you support the approach to retail development that is outlined?			
Responses received	188		
Yes -		No clear answer:	
Key organisations	8	Key organisations	1
Individuals	123	Individuals	3
Landowners	6	Landowners	1
Total	137 responses	Total	4
No -			
Key organisations	2		
Individuals	41		
Landowners	4		
Total	47 responses		
Response		Actions	
<p>The majority support the approach.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Herts County Council (Transport) supports the existing retail hierarchy as town centres are well served by passenger transport, but points out the importance of local shops in new neighbourhoods. The scale of development envisaged for Mayland should ensure the viability of local shops there.</p>		<p>Take forward the approach outlined for retail development.</p> <p>Set out a retail hierarchy and areas for out of centre retail development.</p> <p>Set out a sequential approach for considering</p>	

Manor Estate Residents Association disagrees with the approach as much of the floorspace in the town centre is vacant. Refurbishment, with the Waterhouse Square proposals, is needed. Jarman Fields attracts anti-social behaviour and future development should aim to reduce this.

Friends of the Earth states that allowing any non-bulky goods retail at Jarman Fields would put pressure on the town centre, which already has a number of vacant units.

Berkhamsted Town Council would like retail provision in Berkhamsted to be more spread out to avoid congestion.

Tring Rural Parish Council disagrees because they believe that the empty shops in Tring could accommodate future capacity up to 2016.

Comments from individuals:

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- We are proposing far more retail floorspace than can be supported by residents.
- There is no point building new shops while so many are vacant. Vacant sites should be rejuvenated.
- More shops will become unviable due to online shopping, which is becoming more popular.
- More shops mean more people will travel to them. Instead telephone or internet shopping points should be available for everyone locally.
- Hemel Hempstead needs a more dynamic and robust strategy with enterprise and innovation to attract employers.
- Allowing any more retail at Jarman Fields (Hemel Hempstead) would put pressure on the town centre, which already has a number of vacant units.
- The proposed Water Lane development is contrary to the character of Berkhamsted and there are too many vacancies on the High Street.
- The approach is too focussed on Hemel Hempstead: the shops in Tring need some support.

People who agreed gave the following comments/caveats:

- Business rates need to stay relatively low.

applications for retail development.

- It is important to support neighbourhood shops.
- There must be support for small independent shops.
- There is a need for short term parking to help shops remain viable in villages.
- The shops in Hemel Hempstead are all quite generic and it would be nice to include some independent shops in any redevelopment.
- Hemel Hempstead town centre is a disgrace. There are lots of empty shops, the market area is scruffy and the river from Gadebridge to Riverside is “disgusting”. If all these were tidied up, it would encourage people to spend time outside in town and use the area as a place to socialise etc.
- There should be high quality design throughout the town centre.
- The retention of office space in the town centre is supported, because allowing change of use from office to residential in town centres reduces the viability of shops.
- If shops are to be successful at Maylands, then there must be more than just lunchtime trade.

Comments from landowners:

- Although the approach is supported, one commenter would like the Core Strategy to define the amount of comparison and convenience floor space in each of the centres.
- There should be greater recognition of the need to make Hemel Hempstead a more attractive place to shop and visit.
- There should be a greater emphasis on the need for improvements to the range and quality of retail provision in Hemel Hempstead town centre to prevent loss of trade to other centres. Retail is a key driver of the economic prosperity of the Borough. There is no mention of retail led regeneration.
- However, an alternative view doubts the need for more retail floor space in Hemel Hempstead town centre given the vacant units at Riverside pre-recession.
- While Marlowes is a main shopping frontage, the Council must be flexible towards non-A1 [non-shop] floor space to avoid too many vacancies.

- Whilst it is considered appropriate to protect the retail function of town centres, the potential for smaller-scale, complementary retail provision to serve new and existing market town communities should be recognised.
- Redesignating Jarman Fields as an out-of-centre retail location is contrary to advice within PPS6 and the emerging draft PPS4. It will damage the vitality and viability of Hemel Hempstead town centre.
- A new local centre at Maylands is encouraged. It should be linked with residential growth in the wider area to ensure its evening viability. It could be in a number of locations: there is no justification in the core strategy as to why it has to be in the Heart of Maylands. A new centre would serve new and existing residential areas as well as the business community.
- There is one objection to the Retail Study Update 2009, which is said to be flawed. The data used for vacancy levels is out of date, it does not include pedestrian flow count information, the PPS6 indicators are out of date, the rate of expenditure growth assumed is too high, the projections do not take account of unimplemented planning permissions and no increase in turnover efficiency is assumed.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with the approach that is outlined for “Tourism”?

Responses received	180
Yes - Key organisations	8
Individuals	141
Landowners	7
Total	156 responses
No - Key organisations	0
Individuals	22
Landowners	2
Total	24 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The overwhelming majority agreed.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>British Waterways supports with the reference to the Grand Union Canal and Tring Reservoirs, and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism depends on accommodation, attractions and transport and we would like to see the role of sustainable forms of transport mentioned in this section. <p>The Box Moor Trust:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Box Moor Trust estate should be explicitly noted in the text. • The Trust makes a significant contribution to this area, particularly around conservation management and educational facilities on our moors and woodlands that are accessible to everyone. The moors are very visible and are an important entrance to Hemel Hempstead. <p>Berkhamsted Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a dearth of accommodation for tourists and many of the sites mentioned are only accessible by car. Not everyone walks or cycles and to expect them to is wishful thinking. <p>Natural History Museum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The core strategy should include policies to encourage improvements to the service offered by the Museum and increased visitor numbers <p>Comments from individuals:</p> <p><i>People who agreed but made the following points:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient sites and churches should be mentioned. • Apsley Paper Trail should be added as a visitor attraction. • Tourism adds to congestion so it needs to be managed. • Tourism should be changed to 'sustainable tourism'. 	<p>Take the approach to Tourism forward in sections under Strengthening Economic Prosperity and Providing Homes and Community Services.</p>

People who disagreed gave the following reasons:

- Tourism has a negative impact on the environment as it encourages travel: this should be recognised.
- More needs to be done to improve the quality of existing places, such as Leisureworld.

Comments from landowners:

- The Trustees of Apsley Paper Trail consider that the ignores the importance of the industrial heritage of the borough. Frogmore Mill and Apsley Paper Trail are not mentioned even though there is a heritage and visitor centre at Frogmore Mill, the birthplace of paper making in the United Kingdom.
- The need for Green Belt reviews should be recognised here, as the most appropriate location for the proposed Town Stadium may be in the Green Belt.
- The standard of hotel sought should be flexible in order to fit market requirements. The core strategy itself should not specify a 'high quality hotel'.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with the policy approach for “Looking after the Environment” which is outlined?

Responses received 211

Yes - Key organisations 26
 Individuals 135
 Landowners 6
Total 167 responses

No clear answer -
 Key organisations 2
 Individuals 1
 Landowners 0
Total 3 responses

No - Key organisations 6
 Individuals 33
 Landowners 2
Total 41 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The substantial majority agreed.</p> <p>Comments from key organisations:</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Municipal Waste Spatial Strategy identifies the need for a larger household waste recycling centre at Eastman Way, although no options have been forward for relocation. It also identifies the need for a composting facility in the west of the county: the Hemel Hempstead/Watford corridor has been identified as a suitable location. <p>The Environment Agency believes that the approach should be more aspirational, and seek greater enhancements through developer contributions.</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead GM Action Group supports the approach, but wants the Council to consider the reduction of pesticides and excessive use of artificial fertilizers.</p> <p>Box Moor Trust should be added to the list of conservation bodies. There is also no mention of pingos on the Box Moor estate.</p> <p>CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third and fourth paragraphs should be less urban-centred and seek to address borough-wide deficiencies. • Tranquillity is a borough-wide issue and relates to visual and audible intrusions in urban and rural areas. Policies should recognise the opportunity to improve areas of poor tranquillity. • It draws attention to policies in the East of England Plan. Policy ENV1 requires LDDs to define a hierarchy of green infrastructure and to identify where additional green infrastructure is required. Policy ENV3 requires LDDs to take account of BAP targets and priorities identified in county biodiversity network maps. • Energy efficiencies should be made to the existing building stock (ref. East of England Plan, para 9.4). 	<p>Take forward the approach for Looking after the Environment. Technical studies will inform the strategy for Climate Change.</p>

Chilterns Conservation Board:

- Locally produced building materials should be promoted..

The Ramblers:

- Development proposals should maintain existing access to the countryside, enhance relevant green corridors, pedestrian routes, countryside views and bridleways, and links to existing pedestrian networks.
- Adequate landscaping and lighting should be provided, along with other design considerations, to enable a safe pedestrian environment throughout the borough.
- Policy wording is suggested - **see Appendix.**

The Council's Sustainability Officer:

- the Core Strategy should include policies which encourage and preserve farms, allotments and orchards. These growing areas are vital for biodiversity and local food security and more important with concerns around peak oil increasing food prices.

The leader of Transition Town Berkhamsted:

- The use of renewables should be integrated into the existing housing stock.
- Generation of energy from waste should be pursued, as well as harvesting biomass from large woodlands.

Herts Biological Records Centre:

- Development should seek to avoid, mitigate, or compensate its impact on the environment (specific to the Heritage, Biodiversity and Landscape Character).
- Planning policy should support agricultural activities, such as extensive livestock farming.
- There should be specific reference to the recognised hierarchy of sites with biodiversity and geodiversity value.
- The natural resources section should include horticultural activities and forestry.

The Chiltern Society and London Green Belt Council:

- More attention should be given to water supply. This is already stretched to breaking point in the Chilterns. Water is scarce and needs to be conserved to prevent rivers from drying up.

Dacorum Environmental Forum is concerned that the emerging core strategy proposes to destroy three working farms, one being one of the last dairy farms in the county.

Herts County Council (Environment Department):

- The term, heritage, is not appropriate: historic environment should be used instead, as per PPS15.
- The vision diagrams do not sufficiently cover historic environment.

Markyate Care Group believes that the Council should reduce the proposed development for Markyate as this will help with traffic issues.

Berkhamsted Town Council wishes the Core Strategy to consider biodiversity protection measures.

Thames Water:

- It is essential that adequate utilities infrastructure, particularly water and sewerage, is in place prior to development.
- Policy text is suggested for water and sewerage capacity; and utilities development – **see Appendix.**

Comments from individuals:

People who disagreed made the following comments:

- The approach to heritage, biodiversity and landscape character is particularly important.
- The strategy for development should also refer to the quality and quantum of the environment for wildlife and undeveloped open spaces.
- Wildlife sites should be protected and more nature reserves developed.
- The accessibility of the countryside should be improved both to new and existing housing areas (reference could be made to English Nature’s access and space ANGST standards).

- The Green Belt should be protected from development.
- Conserving the countryside, landscape and open space should have higher priority than the generation of renewable and low carbon energy, if it would detract from them.
- Small parks should be maintained.
- Apsley Paper Trail should be added to the list of features of the historic environment.
- There should be policies for improving the carbon footprints of new and existing development.
- The generation of energy from renewable resources should be mandatory, not simply encouraged. A 20 year strategy will not be able to deal with urgent environmental matters unless there are specific targets: i.e. all new development by 2010 includes solar energy and drinking water should not be used to for flushing toilets.
- More resources should be allocated to developing the natural environment as opposed to just the built environment. This will help towards reducing carbon dioxide emissions.
- This section should include how the Council plans to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in the borough.
- There should be more emphasis on recycling.
- The sustainability of our water courses should be promoted (referring to Environment Agency Management Plans as appropriate).
- Car travel should not be restricted to the point that shoppers choose to shop in other towns.
- Public transport needs a major overhaul.
- There is insufficient reality about the lack of infrastructure funding: any growth will affect the environment.
- There is a concern that there will be more development in the floodplain in Markyate and an increase in water run-off into the High Street as a result.
- There is also a concern that the Grand Union Canal could become a cycle track.

- Land at Shootersway, Berkhamsted should be protected from development.

Comments from landowners:

- The approach tries to protect everything but in reality adverse impacts are a part of development and some must be tolerated. It is therefore essential that environmental policy provides some flexibility in application.
- Any requirements must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate site specific considerations and ensure that development is achievable and deliverable across the Plan period.
- Future development growth can create opportunities to enhance a landscape character and ecological and environmental value of an area, together with creating a high quality setting for new development to the benefit of the local area and the wider Borough, and should be actively supported.
- Proper resources should be allocated to make landscape improvements to Maylands Business Park.
- The Trustees of Apsley Paper Trail believe that Frogmore Mill needs to be given greater acknowledgement, as it is the birthplace and the last vestige of the paper making industry.

2. PLACES

- **Berkhamsted**
- **Bovingdon**
- **Hemel Hempstead**
- **Kings Langley**
- **Markyate**
- **Tring**
- **Countryside**

BERKHAMSTED

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the vision for Berkhamsted?

752 responses received

Yes - 52 responses

No - 699 responses

Response

The majority of respondents did not agree with the vision for Berkhamsted:

- The proposed level of housing should be more specific. There have been a number of very large developments in the town. Therefore to propose “similar levels of new housing as in the recent past” appears to suggest a continued over development. This contradicts the aim of maintaining the nature and character of the market town.
- A restrained level of growth, which blends in with the character of Berkhamsted, is required. Town cramming with little landscaping should be avoided (e.g. the Locks development).
- An opposite view is that Berkhamsted can accommodate strategic housing growth. This would be complementary to growth at Hemel Hempstead and would provide significant planning benefits to the town.
- The vision is unbalanced. It should also reflect the need to attract and support local employment and businesses in the town. The town has become a commuter and dormitory town. .
- Reference is made to quality schools but most of them are private. Families in new affordable housing cannot afford to send their children to private schools. The capacity of other schools should be addressed.
- The vision should recognise more fully the challenges

Actions

Take the vision forward.

Emphasise the sustainable role of the town and remove the Fair Trade town reference.

Remove the statement: ‘it will accommodate similar levels of new housing as in the recent past’.

caused by pressure on infrastructure, parking and water resources and congestion. These are key issues.

- The vision should focus more on preserving the heritage and dealing with existing problems. Local facilities, services and open space need to be protected and enhanced. This should have priority over housing.
- Reference should be made to traffic congestion and its management – current levels are unsustainable and do not respect the built and natural heritage of Berkhamsted.
- The vision should recognise the value of peripheral areas and roads for recreation (walking, cycling etc). It should encourage non-car use and promote the natural environment.
- More reference should be made to protecting and maintaining local people's connection with the natural environment.
- The vision is not far sighted enough. There should be more emphasis on making the town more sustainable and less reliant on fossil fuels – should include sustainable transport option, improving energy efficiency of houses and develop a sustainable food strategy.
- No reference has been made to climate change.
- On the other hand it is said that reference to Fair Trade and Transition Town status does not seem appropriate for long term planning policy.
- The vision is contradictory – for example delivering new homes while protecting the role of the market town and villages, ensuring efficient use of land while maintaining the variety of character.
- The vision should place more emphasis on improving the vibrancy of Northchurch.
- The vision should recognise that the town is more than just a valley settlement - it has already spread over the hilltops to the south.

Those who agreed with the vision had the following provisos:

- Reference must be made to providing new infrastructure first to support new housing.
- There must be adequate provision for improved traffic

flows.

- Careful consideration should be given to 'accommodating similar levels of new housing as in recent past' to avoid the loss of Berkhamsted's key features and character.
- The vision appears to suggest too much development.
- Affordable housing should be provided for key workers.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Berkhamsted Town Council agree with the broad thrust of the vision subject to the following points:

- More reference to the need for adequate infrastructure to support new houses is required.
- The level of housing will be critical in determining whether the vision can be achieved.
- Reference to Fair Trade and Transition Towns should be deleted because these are not considered planning issues.
- A clearer definition of the types of housing should be provided – there should be more houses for families.

Northchurch Parish Council does not support the vision. Northchurch is a separate community from Berkhamsted with different issues and problems and should be treated as a separate entity.

Herts Country Council Highways would like to see reference to sustainable transport which would be relevant given that a key issue is congestion.

The Environment Agency agrees with the vision but it should consider the need for flood risk assessments for all riverside and canal side developments and developments over 1ha. All developments should be set back from the river/canal corridor.

Herts Biological Records Centre and the Wildlife Trust would like the linear nature of the valley and its role as a wildlife

corridor along the Bulbourne / Grand Union Canal to be emphasised more strongly within the vision.

Chilterns Conservation Board want the vision to refer to the Chilterns AONB and River Bulbourne (which rises at Cow Roast) as environmental assets that should be protected.

Hertfordshire Gardens Trust wants reference to small Victorian estates on the west of the town – Ashlyns, Haresfoot and Woodcock Hill.

QUESTION 2

Are there any additional key issues we should be considering?

744 responses received

Yes - 714 responses

No - 29 responses

Response

Actions

The issues raised are as follows:

Transport:

- Quality of roads and pavements.
- On-road parking within side streets.
- Noise and pollution caused by increased traffic.
- Improving public transport to reduce car use into the centre and cycle connections.
- The impact of traffic from [proposed] development at Shootersway on the Kingshill Way junction and the impact of through traffic on peripheral roads.

Housing:

- Provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites and the

Assess infrastructure issues further. The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation and Delivery Plan will provide an audit of any infrastructure required.

Liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough.

<p>impact of these sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The balance of houses to flats - too many flats are currently being built. <p>Northchurch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to facilities at Northchurch and enhancing economic / retail viability and attractiveness of the village to maintain its distinct character. • Car parking in Northchurch. <p>Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of farmland. • Impact of climate change. • Meeting the aims of a Transition Town / Fair Trade Town. • Protecting the AONB and avoiding coalescence with Hemel Hempstead. <p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of more allotment space. • Impact of more houses on available water supplies and other utilities. <p>Economy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocating business to out of town locations (near the by-pass) and redeveloping Billet Lane for affordable housing. • Improving the infrastructure for existing residents before new houses are built. • Encouraging more sustainable businesses to the town. • Increasing the development potential of Berkhamsted so as to bring investment to the town. This comment supports the development of housing sites to the south of the town. <p>Social and Community Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving facilities for the young and elderly to avoid 	<p>Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs and Facilities.</p> <p>Take forward retail and employment issues under Strengthening Economic Prosperity, Creating Jobs and Full Employment and Supporting Retailing and Commerce.</p> <p>Pick up environmental issues under the section Looking After the Environment.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Study will be delivered to help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p> <p>Note link between development and flight paths.</p>
---	--

them having to travel out of town.

- Maintaining civic cohesion.
- Ensuring safety and security.

Town Centre Improvements:

- Improving the vitality of the town centre and its ability to handle its visitors' needs.
- Retaining the mix of retail uses.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Town Council would like to see the follow additional issues added:

- Loss of gardens together with the effects this has on amenity space and ecological corridors.
- Maintaining the character [of residential] areas.
- Loss of farmland.
- Needs for cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency would like to see the following issues added:

- Naturalisation of the River Bulbourne corridor by deculverting as part of any new development.
- Encouraging suitable redevelopment of historic landfill sites.

Chilterns Conservation Board:

- Enhancing the River Bulbourne and ensuring development properly addresses issues of flood risk and run-off.

Hertfordshire Gardens Trust:

- Protection of the historic landscape.

Herts Biological records Centre and Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust:

- Promoting the natural environment - sustaining and

<p>enhancing green links to surrounding Green Belt, making biodiversity enhancements and emphasising protection (reference was made to Government advice in PPS1, PPS7, PPS9 and Policies ENV1 and ENV3 in the East of England Plan, as well as the duty in the Natural England and Rural Commission Act to promote biodiversity).</p> <p>London Luton Airport Operations Limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development must not prejudice the expansion of the airport indicated in the White Paper on the Future of Air Transport White Paper. Development sites should be located so as to avoid existing and future flight paths. 	
--	--

QUESTION 3

Do you agree with this level of growth?	
<p>757 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 29 responses</p> <p>No - 730 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority thought level of growth the level of growth was too high for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads are already heavily congested and parking is a problem. Pollution will increase. • Schools are oversubscribed with children already having to travel out of the town to reach other schools. • Berkhamsted has reached capacity: infrastructure and utilities cannot support more growth. • There has already been significant development in the area; this will represent over-development for a town the size of Berkhamsted. • This level of development would impact on the character of the historical market town and 	<p>Take forward two growth level options for further consideration.</p>

population.

- The Green Belt and farmland should be protected from development. It is important to maintain land to produce more local food.
- It seems too many to sustain the existing population
- There are adequate playing and outdoor facilities. They should be properly utilised before providing more.
- The level of development does not appear to be matched with increased employment provision, which is required to ensure a sustainable local economy.
- This figure will not preserve the quality of life and heritage of the town and its environs.
- There is no justification or evidence for the figure suggested.
- It appears to have an unproportionately high level proposed compared with other market towns. A maximum of 750 dwellings would be more appropriate to maintain population levels and avoid pressure for greenfield releases.

On the other hand, some respondents thought the level proposed was too low:

- 1200 dwellings do not seem adequate to cater for the scale of natural change expected to 2031, which will cause displacements of communities to and in other towns.
- 1500 would be more appropriate to provide for an adequate level of affordable housing so local people do not have to move away.
- Berkhamsted is the second largest settlement within the Borough and should accommodate a higher level of growth. Creating a new community to the south of the town would be more beneficial because supporting infrastructure would be an integral part of the development meeting future needs.

Those who did agree with the level of growth made the following proviso:

- Improvements to the town's infrastructure should also be identified as part of the strategy.

- Further employment opportunities must be created to support this growth.
- Growth must benefit the town directly in terms of housing for people who want to work locally and help deliver local services – not to be provided for commuters who could live anywhere.
- 1,200 should be seen as the minimum number of dwellings.
- Gardens should not be treated as brownfield sites.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Berkhamsted Town Council and Northchurch Parish Council do not agree with this level of growth:

- Detail should be provided as to how this figure was obtained and why a different approach to the other market town in the borough has been taken.
- Only 750 dwellings should be provided, thus avoiding Green Belt releases.
- 1200 houses is not marginal development or population growth. This does not accord with the vision and runs counter to maintaining or achieving the majority of the stated “key issues”. It does not also accord with the Town Council’s vision of the town.
- Northchurch should be grouped with other rural villages in which only limited small scale infilling would be allowed.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree that we should rule out the locations set out in Table 2?

722 responses received

Yes - 71 responses

No - 651 responses

Response

Actions

The majority said 'No'. The reasoning varies from those proposing a site to those objecting to development (particularly in the Shootersway area) and wanting other alternatives.

Take forward rejected sites.

General:

- The reasons for rejecting these locations can be equally applied to the other 4 options – this appears to be inconsistent and undermines a proper evaluation of pros and cons for sites in both lists.
- The pros for sites in Table 2 should be listed and compared with sites in Table 3.
- The buffer between the by-pass and the town should be preserved.
- Some of these sites are brownfield and should be developed first.
- Development should be spread around several locations and would have less impact than one single development.
- Sites within the valley bottom have easier access to bus and rail links than sites on the ridge.

Bank Mill Lane:

- It is no further from the town than Durrants Lane or Northchurch.
- It could provide a good location for eco-homes. Tree lined roads would act as a buffer between the

<p>new houses and the existing road / houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would have less impact here than houses built up higher valley sides. It would enhance the entrance to Berkhamsted and the appearance of the Bulbourne. <p><i>Land at Ivy House Lane:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is more closed associated with the urban area, being bounded by established residential development on three sides. • It would provide a more defensible Green Belt boundary. <p><i>Land adjacent to the by-pass/south of the town:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A41 has redefined the town boundary so development here would have little impact on the perceived size of the town. • Some land is of little amenity value. • Development would give the opportunity to create a sustainable urban extension, addressing the needs and priorities of the town and allowing for maximum affordable housing provision. 	
--	--

QUESTION 5a

Do you prefer Option 1 (at New Road, Northchurch) for greenfield development in Table 3?	
732 responses received	
Yes - 40 responses	
No - 691 responses	
Response	Actions
The majority of respondents did not prefer Option 1, predominantly because they agreed with the cons listed in Table 3. Other reasons are as follows (they include the Town Council's views):	Do not pursue Option 1 unless necessary.

- It would add to an already difficult traffic situation on New Road: access is poor and dangerous for pedestrians across the canal bridge.
- It is too close to the noisy railway line.
- The site is too large and the suggested density too high for Northchurch.
- On the other hand, the site is too small to deliver leisure facilities for the overall town, or to provide sufficient contribution to complete the New Road/Springfield Road link.
- The site is poorly located in relation to the southbound A41.
- It is visually prominent.
- Loss of the Green Belt here would destroy the continuous open land on the valley floor in and around the canal and impact on the AONB.
- It is poorly connected to local facilities.
- There would be pressure on local schools, resulting in increased traffic taking children to alternative schools further away.
- It would set a precedent for further development in this area.

Those who preferred this option gave the following reasons:

- The site is within the valley floor, allowing level pedestrian and cycle access to the town centre and station.
- Additional homes could contribute to reviving the economic viability of Northchurch.
- It would be less intrusive on its local environment.
- There is good access to roads, public transport links, the school and the local centre's services and amenities.
- It is of an appropriate size and scale for the town with clearly defined boundaries (represents good infill development).
- Funding towards a new road bridge could be a significant benefit for the town and help congestion in

Northchurch .

- There is already a local bus link.
- The site is available without constraint for development and improvements to vehicular and pedestrian access would be incorporated.

Some provisos were raised:

- It should provide less than 50 dwellings.
- Careful consideration should be given to the site's proximity to the canal, wildlife sites, railway and Chilterns AONB.
- It should provide local recreation facilities.
- The new link road/canal bridge should be completed at the same time or a separate pedestrian bridge provided.
- It should provide a significant level of affordable housing for local need.
- The local primary school must be able to accommodate this development.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Northchurch Parish Council:

- The site has previously been considered as unsuitable (reference is also made to the Northchurch Parish Plan).

Environment Agency:

- A flood risk assessment would be required. Development adjacent to the canal should be set back to conserve/enhance the biodiversity of the green corridor and reduce flood risk.

Chilterns Conservation Board:

- Development is likely to affect the setting of the Chilterns AONB.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:

- The site has wildlife value, enhanced by being next to

the canal and public access to it.	
------------------------------------	--

QUESTION 5b

Do you prefer Option 2 (at Hilltop Road) for greenfield development in Table 3?

723 responses received

Yes - 659 responses

No - 64 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents preferred Option 2, which is also supported by the representative of Ashlyns School. The majority of respondents agreed with the pros listed in Table 3. Other reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school site would still be sufficiently large to provide playing fields for the school and for community use. • New development would enhance the environment because it is next to development that is architecturally poor. • There is good road access and easy access to facilities and public transport links. • The site is well related to the town being bordered on three sides by housing – a natural extension to the existing built area. • It is appropriate in terms of size and scale and would cause minimum damage to the town and Green Belt. • It is within walking distance of the town centre, shops and services. • It would add minimum congestion to access roads to the A41. • Funds raised for school facilities would benefit the whole community by addressing the deficit in sporting facilities. <p>Some provisos were raised:</p>	<p>Do not pursue Option 2 for housing development.</p>

- Contributions should be put into educational facilities.
- Development should provide less than 50 dwellings.
- It should not be too visible across the valley.
- Access should be onto Hilltop Road.
- Any trees lost should be replaced.

Those who did not prefer this option gave the following reasons (they incorporate the Town Council's views):

- The cons outweigh the pros, particularly loss of playing fields which goes against the vision and Healthy Schools' policies.
- The setting for Ashlyns School would be affected and mature trees lost..
- The site provides much needed valuable leisure space.
- Development would cause traffic congestion as road access is constrained.
- The school strategy review should be completed first.
- Development is not needed.
- Development would have a visual impact being located high on the valley side.
- The site should only come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme incorporating other sites located to the south of the town.

Comments from Key Organisations:

This option was preferred by HCC Highways because it is close to the town and on a bus route. However it is not large enough to ask for developer contributions significant enough to contribute towards bus services (the comment also applies to other options).

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

Sports England objects to this option because it will result

in loss of playing fields which, if surplus to school requirements, could be used to meet unmet community playing field needs. It would not accord with PPG17 of Sports England Playing Fields Policy.

CPRE - The Hertfordshire Society objects because the site is difficult to access through adjoining roads; there would be a loss of playing fields; the existing Green Belt boundary would be breached and development would affect the setting of Ashlyns School.

QUESTION 5c

Do you prefer Option 3 (next to Hanburys, Shootersway) for greenfield development in Table 3?

723 responses received

Yes - 23 responses

No - 700 responses

Response

The majority of respondents did not prefer Option 3 predominantly because they agreed with the cons listed in Table 3. Other reasons are as follows (they incorporate the views of the Town Council and CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society):

- The site is outside the settlement boundary within the Green Belt.
- It does not represent a natural extension to the urban area.
- It is an unsustainable, isolated location, not within the valley floor. The site is too far from the town centre and facilities with no public transport. It would increase the number of cars on the road.
- It would set a precedent for expansion towards the A41 – this whole area currently acts as a natural buffer between the town and the bypass.
- There would be an adverse visual impact and

Actions

Consider Option 3 further.

probable loss of trees.

- Supporting infrastructure will need providing first.
- Potential for expansion of the British Film Institute (BFI should not be regarded as a benefit – why should it be tied to or constrained by the need for residential development?)
- The density of development will be out of character with surrounding areas.
- This is a dangerous and congested road junction (direct access onto Shootersway is not an advantage).
- This is a valuable area of open leisure space, woodland and arable farmland.
- The size of the site is insufficient on its own and should only be considered as part of a comprehensive development with other land identified to the south of the town.

Those who did prefer this option gave the following reasons:

- The BFI is an asset to the town so would support development which can help facilitate it and the further employment it offers.
- It is close to schools and adjacent to similar type of development.
- The site offers little amenity value and is not particularly visible to local residents.

Some provisos were raised:

- A maximum of 40 dwellings would be more in keeping with the green character of this area.
- Direct access onto Shootersway should be seen as a disadvantage. It would require a roundabout to ease congestion.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

QUESTION 5d

Do you prefer Option 4 (next to Blegberry Gardens, Shootersway) for greenfield development in Table 3?

740 responses received

Yes - 26 responses

No - 713 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not prefer Option 4 predominantly because they agreed with the cons listed in Table 3. Other reasons are as follows (they incorporate the Town Council's views):

Do not pursue Option 4 for housing development.

- The site is used for farming – hence it is needed for food production to assist the UK in becoming more self sufficient.
- It is in an unsustainable location, not within the valley floor, too far from local services, the Town Centre and railway station with no public transport links, thus increasing reliance on car use and increasing congestion.
- The site should be used for leisure facilities.
- It is too close to the strategic site at Egerton Rothesay School, Durrants Lane.
- This is a visible site close to the Chilterns AONB.
- It uses the Green Belt.
- It would set a precedent for expansion in the Green Belt towards the A41 – this whole area currently acts as a natural buffer between the town and the bypass.
- The density of development would be too high and out of character with surrounding areas. It would be contrary to density policies outlined in the Local Plan, emerging Core Strategy and Urban Design Assessment which require low density development

in peripheral locations.

- This is a relatively large site which would have a negative impact on the buffer between the existing settlement and the by-pass.
- Road access is poor: roads are semi-rural and already significantly congested.
- This is a valuable area of open leisure space, woodland, arable farmland adjacent to Blegberry Gardens, and development would have a significant impact on existing residents.

Those who did prefer this option gave the following reasons:

- The site is suitable, deliverable and available.
- It has well defined site boundaries and is large enough to meet future housing needs.
- There is good access to roads, schools and leisure facilities.
- Cars leaving this site would not have to travel through the town.
- Infrastructure requirements can be shared with the strategic housing site at Egerton Rothesay School
- It is not very visible.

Some provisos were raised:

- The density should be reduced.
- Consideration should be given to the inclusion of the adjoining land (managed by Knight Frank) which could be made available to mitigate density concerns.
- Trees / landscaping should be provided as a noise barrier to the A41.
- Traffic / road improvements would be required including access to the town centre.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

Hertfordshire Gardens Preservation Trust is concerned that development may affect the Woodcock Hill Estate – this contains a Victorian garden and villa largely as designed in the nineteenth century

QUESTION 6

Do you agree to the approach to “looking after the environment” of Berkhamsted outlined above?

725 responses received

Yes - 63 responses

No - 661 responses

Response

The majority of respondents said they do not agree with the approach to “looking after the environment”. The majority did say they agreed with the overall intentions of the strategy and thought some elements were consistent with their own views. However development proposals would contradict the approach set out.

Reasons for not agreeing are as follows:

- High density developments are not environmentally beneficial and the wildlife corridor in Shootersway will be comprised.
- No protection is given to the surrounding Green Belt.
- Green field sites should be retained.
- The representation and characterisation of open space in the vision diagram and under 5.1(i) could be more specific.
- The town’s individual character will be spoiled. Regard should be given to the existing conditions of different parts of town.

Actions

Take forward approach to looking after the environment as consistent with other places.

Consider the justification for the link road in Northchurch through a feasibility study.

- The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment seems to be heavily weighted towards precluding development in the valley. The council should commission their own FRA's in certain locations rather than wait for developers to complete them to identify mitigation measures.
- It fails to acknowledge the importance of views over open farmland from footpaths to the south and how these views will be affected by development.
- This policy is best suited to large suburban environments and not historic country town surrounded by countryside.
- The strategy fails to address concerns around the increased level of traffic congestion and resulting pollution.
- The strategy should take on some of the burden of a transition to a low-carbon economy, for example reducing reliance on the car.
- The proposed development on the Egerton Rothesay site is not in line with this approach – it is a high density development in a low density environment and will have an impact on the natural environment and biodiversity.
- It seems to suggest the removal of the link road which will not make a contribution to the environment in Northchurch. There is a high level of traffic through the village High Street (and air quality is currently 30% below what is regarded as acceptable).

Those who agreed with the approach made the following provisos / comments:

- It conflicts with some of the development options being proposed.
- Character area definitions for the town need to be strengthened and taken note of.
- Particular attention should be given to the protection and enhancement of the river corridor.
- Account should be taken of the potential flood risks associated with run-off and the river and canal.
- Trees in roads such as North Road and Graemesdyke Road should be protected.
- Town centre densities should be reviewed. Recent

<p>developments are having an impact on the character of the conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be framed to promote continuous links of open space/hedgerows to encourage wildlife corridors across the valley. • Should this also include improved accessibility to open space? <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>The Town Council agrees with the approach but considers that the densities of new developments should be set so as to be consistent.</p> <p>British Waterways would like the words “and enhanced” to be added to the end of paragraph 5.1 a)(v) after “... needs to be protected”.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the recognition given in the strategy to the River Bulbourne. It wants reference made to the AONB and flood risk related to surface water run-off and the river. The river is a chalk stream – a priority habitat in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	
--	--

QUESTION 7

Do you think the Council should be more flexible in its approach to new development on school sites in the Green Belt?	
722 responses received	
Yes - 32 responses No - 690 responses	
Response	Actions
The majority of respondents do not agree. Their concern is that flexibility would allow the development of new housing	Liaise with Herts

on school sites [which is not correct].

- The school review should be completed first.
- School sites must be retained for leisure and school purposes.
- Playing fields and green areas around schools are essential for pupil's health and development and act as a noise buffer to surrounding houses.
- A more stringent approach should be taken - Green Belt land should be protected and maintained.
- Schools should have to prove special circumstances just like any other development in the Green Belt.

Those who agreed gave the following provisos:

- It should allow development for school expansion / educational purposes only.
- The level of development allowed on different sites should be carefully considered and monitored to maintain sufficient outside recreation space.
- It must not significantly encroach further into the Green Belt.
- School expansion is needed to support new housing development and there is no other possible location.

Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to agree school requirements and potential sites for new school facilities.

QUESTION 8

Do you agree that the existing employment areas should be safeguarded for employment uses?

721 responses received

Yes - 73 responses

No - 648 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents did not agree with for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more flexible approach should be provided to allow a change of use in the future with the changing employment structure (move from industry to service sectors). • They are brownfield sites and therefore if redundant should be redesignated for housing. • Berkhamsted is mainly a commuter town. • Berkhamsted is not an industrial town: most sites have limited commercial viability and should be relocated out of the valley near to the by-pass to improve accessibility. <p>Those who agreed made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to retain local employment opportunities. • New areas to support new housing development should also be identified and safeguarded to reduce out-commuting. • The land should be retained if required for commercial purposes: otherwise a flexible approach should be applied to allow development for houses or other uses. • Consideration should be given to relocating them out of the centre. 	<p>Take forward approach to safeguard employment areas because this is consistent with the approach to other places.</p>

QUESTION 9a

Should the British Film Institute be allowed to expand on its site?

721 responses received

Yes - 73 responses

No - 649 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not support this because:

- The BFI lies within the Green Belt - Green Belt boundaries must be preserved.
- It will add to the already congested road network (a view also expressed by HCC Highways).
- There is no viable access for an increased use of the area.
- They should only be allowed to refurbish existing buildings.
- It would have a negative visual impact and would lose a community asset (school playing fields).

Those in support this gave the following reasons:

- It is an important feature of the town and should be encouraged to grow.
- It could mean more local employment.

Some provisos were raised:

- Development must be minimal, within its own site boundaries and sympathetic.

Consider further how to support the British Film Institute.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should not be allowed to expand for housing • Expansion would create a more sustainable business on the site. • The BFI should be encouraged to contribute more to the local community. • Road improvements should be made at the junction of Kingshill Way and Shootersway. 	
--	--

QUESTION 9b

If the site is expanded should it consolidate development in one area of the site?	
<p>702 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 46 responses</p> <p>No - 656 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents did not agree with this. Many answered 'No' because they did not think there should be any expansion at all, for reasons outlined in Question 9a.</p> <p>Some confusion was raised regarding the wording of the question, whether the proposal is to expand the site or expand the BFI on its site.</p> <p>[In order for BFI to fund the expansion of its own activities there would probably need to be enabling development. Question 9b asks whether the expansion of BFI activities and enabling development should be consolidated on part of the BFI site. Question 9c asks whether the development of the BFI site should be linked to greenfield development on the adjoining site – i.e. Option 3 in Question 5.]</p> <p>Those who support this approach gave the following</p>	<p>Consider further how to support the British Film Institute.</p>

<p>reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will keep the site compact. • It will not encroach further into the Green Belt and would have minimal environmental impact. • It would have less visual impact. <p>Some provisos were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should only be used to expand the BFI, and not used for housing. • It should be developed sensitively and sensibly, within its existing boundary. • It should be expanded behind existing buildings and not have any greater impact on traffic congestion. • It should be limited to the proposed 10 dwellings. 	
--	--

QUESTION 9c

If the site is expanded should it link site to possible greenfield development?	
<p>705 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 13 responses</p> <p>No - 692 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents answered 'No' because the site is within the Green Belt and no further expansion or green field development should be proposed. Other reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BFI is close to the A41 which is an 	<p>Consider further how to support the British Film Institute.</p>

inappropriate location for housing.

- The Local Plan Inspector previously rejected proposals to remove this site from the Green Belt.
- The BFI should be limited to expansion within its own site only.
- There are no exceptional circumstances to allow development. The needs of the BFI should not be tied to needs for other greenfield development. It should be treated on its own merits in planning terms not allowed as an excuse to develop housing.
- This may set an undesirable precedent.

Those who supported this gave the following reasons:

- It would enable the BFI to develop as well as accommodate the additional housing land needs.
- It has good access to primary vehicle routes and access to the town centre.
- It would not add significantly to traffic flow along Shootersway.

Some provisos were raised:

- More thought should be given to housing density and infrastructure requirements.
- It should be developed sensitively and sensibly.

QUESTION 10

Do you think we should continue to support the completion of the New Road/ Springfield Road link?

979 responses received

Yes - 304 responses (including a petition signed by 265 Northchurch residents in support)

No - 675 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents, including the Town Council, do not think the Council should continue to support the link road, for the following reasons:

- It has been planned but not implemented for 20 years.
- It would provide no relief or benefit to the problem of traffic congestion. It would only add to it by creating another rat run, increasing traffic flow and highway safety in a residential area and near a school.
- It would just shift the traffic problem from the 4251 onto Bridgewater road / Springfield Road.
- It would increase commercial traffic into and across the town.
- Northchurch will risk losing its separate identity as an independent village by further removing boundaries between Berkhamsted and Northchurch.
- It is costly and would damage the environment and wildlife areas.
- A new link is required on A41 at Shootersway bridge to relieve through traffic entering the town.
- It should only be supported as a key part of an infrastructure plan, not a short term measure to relieve traffic congestion.
- Money should be spent on improving the canal

Consider further the justification for the link road in Northchurch through a feasibility study.

bridge instead.

Those who thought the link road should be supported gave the following reasons:

- It would relieve traffic congestion and flows from the bottom of New Road, the centre of Northchurch and its schools.
- It provides an additional access out of the village to Ashridge.
- It is a logical extension of Springfield Road and relief for Northchurch.
- It would contribute to improved road safety. The pinch point on the canal bridge is currently dangerous for pedestrians using the narrow footpaths as a result of increasing traffic volumes using the existing road. Access to the school would be safer.
- This was one of the original conditions attached to the planning permission at Tunnel Field and should be implemented. The existing canal bridge is inadequate for the volume of traffic using it. It would make access to the industrial area at Northbridge Road from the north easier.

Some proviso were raised:

- Studies should indicate that it will assist the local residents and they have to agree with the findings.
- The route should be changed to accommodate the wildlife sites.
- It should be provided in a way which does not encourage rat running, e.g. traffic calming. .
- No HGV should be allowed to use the link road.
- The new junction with New Road should be designed safely.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Northchurch Parish Council (and Northchurch Residents who have signed a petition) support the completion of the

new link road – it would help reduce heavy traffic passing Northchurch school (traffic and child safety reasons) and relieve traffic pressures on the narrow canal bridge. This was a requirement from the Tunnel Fields development which the Council should continue to support. Completion of the link should not have been raised within this consultation.

The Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust do not support the link road because there have already been loss of Wildlife Sites area at Tunnel Fields (which was not compensated or mitigated against) and this would result in further direct loss, fragmentation and isolation of an important biodiversity habitat.

QUESTION 11

Should the potential for new cycle routes in the town continue to be investigated?

728 responses received

Yes - 707 responses

No - 21 responses

Response

The majority of respondents said 'Yes'. Providing proper safe cycle routes will encourage more people to use a bike for journeys within the town and surrounding areas. It would also help combat congestion and pollution. Some provisos were raised:

- Existing routes and cycle parking facilities should also be improved.
- Improvements along the canal [towpath] should also be made.
- Routes should be safely separated from the traffic to

Actions

Consider further through the Urban Transport Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

encourage children to cycle to school. Routes should not be provided on the roads.

- Pavements and improvements for pedestrians should also be considered.

Those who said 'No' gave the following reasons:

- There are already competing needs for cars and pedestrians on the roads.
- The topography of the town needs to be considered. It would only work along the valley floor. More emphasis should be given to encouraging people to walk into town.
- Some roads have no foot paths. Pedestrians should be considered before cyclists.
- Cycle routes will not work in towns, and it would be better to focus on expanding paths within the countryside.
- Bikes on the road would lead to further congestion because roads are not wide enough.
- The tow path should be retained for walkers.
- This is not a high priority for the town. The Council should ascertain if there is a demand first. Current cycle lanes are underused and so the cost of new provision would be disproportionate to the benefit.

Comments from Key Organisations:

- British Waterways support this and particularly stress the need for greater connectivity to the canal towpath within the town and beyond.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any other concerns regarding the spatial strategy for Berkhamsted?

743 responses received

Yes - 723 responses

No - 21 responses

Response

Actions

A number of other concerns and comments were raised:

Concerns:

- The Spatial Strategy is inconsistent with the vision for the town, particularly in relation to density of development. The Urban Design Assessment outlines that peripheral locations should have detached houses on large plots at very low density (as set out in Table 1 of the spatial strategy). Clarification of low/very low densities are required (concern also expressed by the Town Council)
- Affordable houses should not be located on peripheral locations because occupants cannot easily access services, facilities or employment. This will not comply with aspirations for sustainability.
- The town is already struggling with its current level of development: how will it support more?
- There was significant concern regarding the development at the Egerton Rothesay site. The site contradicts the key principle of the Core Strategy for the following reasons:
 1. It will increase pressure on overstretched schools.
 2. Increase traffic congestion.
 3. There is no public transport system serving this area.
 4. It too far from the town centre or local amenities.
 5. It will lead to destruction of the existing

Pick up issues on the environment, community infrastructure and housing in the general strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Maintain liaison with HCC to bottom out schooling requirements to 2031.

Consider planning requirements and information on Egerton Rothesay site further.

environmental corridor along Shootersway.

6. There are no footpaths or cycle routes.
 7. Utilities are operating at their limit.
 8. It will lead to permanent loss of farmland, impacting on local flora and fauna.
 9. The proposed density is too high and housing types will impact on the character of the existing area.
- There are bats on the Egerton Rothesay site which should be investigated.
 - It fails to address the growing shortage of affordable / accessible housing for local people. These are needed to maintain a good mix of people and population balance.
 - The vision will change the town but not for the better. More focus is needed to retain the town as an attractive market town.
 - Climate change has not been addressed or how to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels.
 - The strategy will lead to overdevelopment and overcrowding.
 - No attention has been given to personal and social welfare.

Comments:

- Northchurch should be developed as a separate, but linked, village. A separate policy statement should be provided. The views from people of Northchurch are different to the views from Berkhamsted.
- New commercial sites should be developed closer to the by-pass with improved transport access.
- Poor infrastructure and utilities should be improved first and then new facilities planned in conjunction with new developments (comment also expressed by the Town Council).
- More focus should be given to improving social facilities, including parks and open space, and health facilities.
- The policy that applies to villages allowing only small-scale infill for local need, should also be applied to Berkhamsted and Northchurch.

- Layouts within new developments should adopt 'home zone' features.
- The car parking problem should be addressed. More attention should be paid to improving non car use, including improved cycle parking and town bus services.
- Development further east of Ivy House Lane and beyond the New Lodge sites should be avoided to avoid coalescence with Hemel Hempstead.
- More land should be set aside for allotments (comment also expressed by the Town Council).
- A new road link from the A41 to Shootersway/Champneys area is required to ease congestion.
- Maintaining the vitality of the town does not come from more people, it comes from preserving the existing character and redevelopment of existing urban areas.
- Careful consideration should be given to the town centre proposals - vehicular access from High Street to the Water Lane car park should not be closed. More routes into town are needed, not less, to avoid traffic congestion. A multi-storey car park should be provided (comment also expressed by the Town Council).
- Development should only take place on brownfield sites.
- Development should only take place within the valley floor to encourage non-car use.
- Careful consideration must be given to height of development: recent developments have not achieved this successfully.
- What was wrong with the previous proposal for 100 dwellings on the Egerton Rothesay site?
- Consideration should be given to realigning the town boundary alongside the A41.
- There are a number of omissions in the report including religious facilities and the open space and wildlife facility at Three Close Lane cemetery.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Northchurch Parish Council are concerned that being associated with Berkhamsted within the Core Strategy, the village is not given the protection afforded to other villages regarding infilling. Infilling should only be permitted for local affordable housing need.

HCC Highways says that development sites, which are not currently well served by public transport, would also not facilitate increased use of public transport. If development is not of a large enough scale to be able to contribute towards bus services, reliance on the car will continue.

Hertfordshire Police Authority does not object to development. However it wishes to ensure that financial contributions are obtained to help support the Police Service and that developments are designed to be secure.

BOVINGDON

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the vision for Bovingdon?

89 responses received

Yes - 53 responses

No - 36 responses

Response

The majority of respondents agreed with the vision. Some comments and provisos were raised:

- Bovingdon should be maintained as a village – no large scale developments, supermarkets or expansion of the prison should be allowed. Development must not encroach into the Green Belt.
- More variety of local services should be promoted.
- Maintaining the vitality of the village should not be reliant on growth.
- Linking the provision of open space with affordable housing will not achieve enough additional open space for a village the size of Bovingdon.
- Affordable housing should be provided, but not at an unproportionally high level. A mix of housing types will be needed.
- The vision contains competing statements – such as proposing ‘new housing’, while creating open space’ and ‘protecting the heritage of the village’.
- There is no spare capacity in the infrastructure, such as at the school.
- On street parking is necessary for the survival of the local shops.
- New development will eat into the existing open land.
- The vision ignores existing problems relating to noise

Actions

Take the vision forward.

The aim of tackling congestion and street parking on the High Street will be removed from the vision and picked up through the general strategy for Bovingdon.

and volume of traffic.

- The vision should reconsider the development of the bypass as proposed in the Bovingdon Plan (1975) to relieve traffic through the village.
- Could the words 'and enhanced' be added to the end of the vision following 'will be protected'.
- The infrastructure must be able to cope with future development.
- Development should be phased over the period in relation to need and infrastructure developments or limitations.
- The vision should 'emphasise the conservation of the natural heritage of the village'.

Those who did not agree with the vision suggested the following changes:

- Evidence of housing need should be illustrated.
- More open space provision is required but this should not be dependent on new housing development.
- The housing level should be reduced and infilling minimised to lessen the impact on existing services and roads.
- Parking should be left as it is. On street parking is necessary for the survival of local businesses.
- Roads, parking and leisure facilities should be improved.
- Bovingdon airfield is a brownfield site and should be identified for housing or the creation of an entire new village to lessen the impact on the existing village community.
- The scale of housing development should be compatible with the existing identity of the village and limited to the confines of the existing settlement boundary.
- Development should not extend into the Green Belt.
- The vision should encourage small individual retailers – not large retailers such as Tesco's.
- There should be more focus on local employment opportunities to avoid Bovingdon becoming a

<p>commuter settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of affordable housing should not be high. Provision should focus on housing for the young and elderly. • The needs of the existing residents should be met before further development takes place including road/parking improvements and improving services and facilities. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>Bovingdon Parish Council supports the general strategy, namely that the level of additional houses should be limited to maintain the existing population levels. The scale of the village, range of services and facilities and infrastructure constraints could not support a greater level. The Parish Council however are opposed to Green Belt land releases to facilitate this growth.</p> <p>HCC Highways says that mention of sustainable transport/walking/cycling is relevant given that a key issue is congestion within the village.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 2

Are there any additional major issues we should be considering?	
<p>76 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 54 responses</p> <p>No - 21 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>Additional issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity of the existing infrastructure and utilities and how many additional people it can support. • The impact Tesco's will have on the village and local 	<p>Assess infrastructure issues further.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation and</p>

<p>businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving sports and leisure facilities, especially for the young, including a skate park, open space, cycle routes, footpaths and nature parks. • Provision of a new health centre, community centre for indoor activities and residential care home. • Use of the airfield – it could be used to create a sports complex, accommodate housing need or a village hall/clubhouse. • The mix of housing types provided, including small properties and bungalows for the elderly to free up larger properties for new families. • Relieving traffic through the village by constructing a bypass as proposed in the Bovingdon Plan (1975) or creating a one way system. • Provision of a suitable off street car park in the village centre and safety improvements. • Enlarging the existing Area of Archaeological Interest • Improving local employment opportunities. • Improved transport provision to surrounding facilities. • Setting land aside for allotments which currently Bovingdon does not have (this is also suggested by Bovingdon Parish Council). • Access to secondary schools. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible ground contamination at Bovingdon Airfield. <p>London Luton Airport Operations Limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship of development sites to flight paths, so as not to prejudice the expansion of Luton Airport (ref. White Paper on the Future of Air Transport). 	<p>Delivery Plan will provide an audit of any infrastructure required.</p> <p>Liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough.</p> <p>Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs and Facilities. A new bypass would not be a cost-effective option.</p> <p>Take forward retail and employment issues under Strengthening Economic Prosperity, Creating Jobs and Full Employment and Supporting Retailing and Commerce.</p> <p>Pick up environmental issues under the section Looking After the Environment.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Study will be delivered to help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p> <p>Note link between development and flight paths.</p>
---	---

QUESTION 3

Do you agree with this level of growth?

80 responses received

Yes - 30 responses

No - 50 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not support this level of growth. Most thought 150 new dwellings would be too high for a number of reasons:

- Current infrastructure - schools, road congestion and parking – is at saturation point and cannot support this level of development.
- Open space should not be developed to create additional open space.
- The vitality and vibrancy of the village was more evident 20 to 30 years ago when the population was smaller. New houses to increase the population are therefore not needed to retain the current vitality.
- Bovingdon’s employment opportunities, facilities and public transport services are likely to be insufficient to support new housing development.
- The village has reached capacity as stated by the inspector at the previous Local Plan Inquiry.

Some suggestions for the level are as follows:

- Half– i.e. 75 units.
- 10 - 50 units, *plus* elderly people’s accommodation to free up larger houses for new families.
- Only the housing which can take place within the existing settlement boundary.
- Only the housing which can be provided on brownfield sites – i.e. through redevelopment of existing properties or employment sites and conversion of vacant commercial buildings.

Take forward alternative growth level options for further consultation.

- 5 -10 units per year, so that development can be easily absorbed into the village [this would total:150-200 units over 20 years].
- The level of development should be dependent on the number of additional people the current infrastructure can support.

Two respondents considered this level was too low and a higher level of houses should be provided in order to:

- promote the vitality and viability of the village;
- accommodate natural population growth;
- secure a higher level of affordable housing; and
- increase the level of developer contributions towards community infrastructure.

Those who agreed with the level of growth gave the following provisos:

- Herts Childrens Schools and Families Unit should address the issues of allowing too many 'outsiders' into the oversubscribed school.
- The split of housing types should be appropriate.
- The level of development should be evenly split over the 25 year period to lessen any impact on the area.
- Elderly accommodation should be provided to free up larger family houses.
- Infrastructure, facilities and car parking should be improved first.
- It is accommodated within Option 1 only.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Bovingdon Parish Council considers the level proposed is too high. It should be reduced to 130 additional dwellings, which is in line with Hertfordshire Council's household predictions.

QUESTION 4a

Do you prefer Option 1 (Duckhall Farm)?

77 responses received

Yes - 17 responses

No - 59 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not prefer Option 1. The following reasons were given:

Option not to be taken any further.

- This is established farmland containing listed buildings and an example of medieval strip farming.
- The land forms an important part of the countryside surrounding the village, an important local amenity and contains a local wildlife habitat/corridor and biodiversity.
- Development would represent a significant loss for biodiversity and is not supported by Herts Biological Centre or Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust.
- The site is located on a busy/congested road, and the access would be dangerous.
- Urban sprawl should be prevented. This is an important site separating the village from the ribbon development further down Box Lane.
- The site is too large, with no defensible boundary.
- Development would not promote a sustainable development strategy compliant with central and regional plan policy.
- No development should take place outside the existing village boundary.

Those who preferred this option gave the following reasons:

- This site will have least impact on current residents and village as a whole

- The site can be accessed without having to travel through the village. Access is good.
- Development of the site would represent an infill between existing properties limiting visual impact.
- It would provide a green area for that part of the village.
- The option offers an excellent opportunity for sustainable development. There is the opportunity to provide a significant level of affordable housing and open space. The site is better located to village facilities than the other options.
- The site is available and deliverable.
- Mitigation measures can be put in place to offset harm to local wildlife and biodiversity.

Some provisos were however raised:

- Some of this land should be used to provide open space now, without waiting for a developer to come along.
- A roundabout or traffic lights should be introduced onto Hempstead Road to calm traffic.
- Development should be phased over 25 years.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways preferred this option because it has most bus routes and access to stops and the village centre is relatively close.

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society opposes development in the Green Belt close to the prison.

QUESTION 4b

Do you prefer Option 2 (rear of Green Lane)?

74 responses received.

Yes - 13 responses

No - 61 responses

Response

Actions

There was little support for this option, considered by many as the worst of the 4 options. The cons listed in the consultation document are agreed. Other comments follow:

Option not to be taken any further.

- Access to the site is poor (via a narrow cul-de-sac) and it is poorly related to main roads and the local facilities.
- It is a highly visible site which would significantly encroach into the countryside to the detriment of the Chiltern Way footpath, ancient hedgerows, mature trees and important wildlife.
- The farmland and wildflower meadow should be preserved.
- Development would have a significant impact on public footpaths surrounding properties.
- Public footpaths on the site are a well used local amenity.
- The risk of flooding would increase.
- The Green Belt should be protected to avoid urban sprawl and a precedent for further development.
- The option would not promote a sustainable development strategy compliant with central and regional plan policy.

Those who preferred this option gave the following reasons:

- The site is near to the village centre and facilities so

people will not have to use their cars (reducing parking problems).

- It is an infill site, not visible from the main road. There would not be any visual impact on the gateway to the countryside nor appearance as urban sprawl.
- There is enough land for leisure, healthcare and a care home.
- There is an opportunity to improve biodiversity.
- The site adjoins existing sport facilities.
- There is easy road and footpath access onto the site.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Herts Biological Records Centre and the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust raise the provisos that if development does occur on this site the wildlife corridor features should be protected.

This is HCC Highways second preferred option because it has access to sustainable transport. If developed, the site should have access to Green Lane.

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society opposes encroachment of the village into the countryside and with no defensible Green Belt boundary.

QUESTION 4c**Do you prefer Option 3 (at Grange Farm)?****67 responses received****Yes - 15 responses****No - 52 responses****Response****Actions**

The majority of respondents did not prefer Option 3. The following reasons were given:

Option not to be taken any further.

- Development would extend the village into the space separating the village and local industries resulting in urban sprawl.
- The site constitutes good agricultural land and an important amenity, opposite Boxmoor Trust land.
- Development would impact on road safety and congestion.
- This is a highly prominent site within the Green Belt and provides a good wildlife habitat.
- The site was previously rejected by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector: no evidence has been provided that previous sustainability concerns have now been addressed.
- This is a less sustainable location than other options - too far from the village centre and key facilities. This runs against the aims for the village and should be given more weight in the sustainability appraisal.
- Development would worsen traffic congestion and add to parking pressures along the High Street.
- It could set a precedent for further development in the Green Belt.
- It would adversely affect the character of Bovingdon Green .

Those who preferred this option gave the following reasons:

- The pros for this site outweigh the cons.
- There is a clear natural defensive boundary which will contain the village within a compact boundary.
- There is good road access and access to the village centre and public transport.
- It is located near the Brickworks, which offers employment opportunities.
- It is a large site which could offer significant community benefits including leisure facilities, affordable housing, open space and relocation of the nursery, as well as provide a significant landscape buffer between the village and Bovingdon Brickworks.

Some provisos were raised:

- Mitigation measures should be put in place to reduce flood risk.
- Consideration should be given to the Boxmoor Trust land.
- Open space should be provided nearer the Moody estate as well as cycle paths/walkways.
- The school should be relocated to this site to resolve traffic issues, free up parking in the High Street and reuse the existing school site for community uses (open space and a health centre).

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

HBRC and the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust raise the provisos that if development does occur on this site the boundary features should be protected given the biodiversity resource of the brickworks which will then be immediately adjacent to the site.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society opposes development in the Green Belt, extending the village towards Bovingdon

Brickworks.	
-------------	--

QUESTION 4d

Do you prefer Option 4 (north of Chesham Road)?	
--	--

70 responses received

Yes - 34 responses

No - 35 responses

Response	Actions
-----------------	----------------

On balance, Option 4 may be considered as the most preferred of the four options. Even so a majority opposed it, for the following reasons:

Option to be taken forward, as the best local allocation that may be available.

- Development of the site would have the least impact on the character of the village or countryside and would have a limited impact on other residents.
- The site is previously developed; it is an eyesore and an environmentally deficient area which has been a longstanding concern for the village. There is an opportunity to enhance the village.
- Being on a main road with good access, development Street.
- The site is not good agricultural land.
- It is of limited wildlife value.
- It can accommodate adequate open space and other elements of the village vision.

Some provisos were raised:

- Footpaths into the village should be improved, including a pedestrian crossing.
- Infrastructure will need improving.
- Herts Biological Records Centre and the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust raise the proviso that the wildlife corridor features should be protected.

Those who did not support this option gave the following reasons:

- Proximity to the prison will impact on the amenity of residents.
- Development could impact on the operation of the prison.
- A wildlife corridor runs through the site.
- The site was previously rejected by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector: no evidence has been provided that previous sustainability concerns have now been addressed.
- The site is separated from the village by a busy road.
- Once development started on the airfield it could continue to spread across the whole area completely changing the village.
- This is a less sustainable location - too far from the village centre and key facilities. This runs against the aims for the village and should be given more weight in the sustainability appraisal.
- Development would impact on traffic congestion and parking along the High Street.
- There is no known landowner / developer interest and the site is in split ownership. It therefore cannot be relied upon to come forward within the life of the Core Strategy.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Environment Agency comments that a flood risk assessment would be required.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society opposes development in the Green Belt close to the prison.

QUESTION 5

Should a key emphasis of the spatial strategy be to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment of Bovingdon?

76 responses received

Yes - 73 responses

No - 3 responses

Response**Actions**

Nearly all respondents agreed that this should be a key emphasis of the spatial strategy because it is important to look after what the village already has, and to preserve it and protect it from development which will impact on the natural environment and historic character (such as Tesco's).

Those who did not think this should be a key emphasis gave the following reasons:

- The development of Bovingdon Airfield should be the key emphasis.
- The strategy should be to provide a balanced village to satisfy the aspirations of the population. Items of historical interest should be protected but not at the expense of 'balance'.

Take forward the principle to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment of Bovingdon.

QUESTION 6

Do you agree that affordable housing should be provided with future housing developments?

65 responses received

Yes - 46 responses

No - 18 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents agreed that affordable housing should be provided with future housing developments provided:

- It is available for local people and is generated by this local need only. It should not be used to provide housing for people from outside of the village.
- It is a small percentage.
- It fits in with the character of the village.
- Its forms part of a mixed housing development to avoid segregation.

Those who did not agree gave the following reasons:

- Houses should be built that are appropriate to the existing character.
- Only a limited number will be required, if the population is to stay at its present level.
- There is already a good proportion of affordable houses in the village.
- It should not constitute a significant proportion of new housing. It is important to provide a mix, including bungalows for the elderly and small properties for couples and single person households.
- Youth problems have increased with the increased

Take forward the principle to provide affordable housing with future housing developments.

<p>number of affordable houses developed in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green fields should not be used. • The village facilities and infrastructure need sorting out before more houses are added. 	
--	--

QUESTION 7

Do you think additional open space should be sought for the village with new housing development?

71 responses received

Yes - 53 responses

No - 18 responses

Response

The majority of respondents agreed with this because there is an already identified shortage of open/leisure space, it is vital for a pleasant environment and is necessary to protect and enhance biodiversity. Some suggestions and provisos were raised:

- The space must be public and accessible to all.
- It must be sympathetic to biodiversity.
- Bovingdon Airfield could be used as the additional open space.

A number of respondents did not agree with this if it involved developing on the Green Belt. Other reasons include:

- Additional open space is needed now: it cannot wait for new housing development.
- There is already adequate open space surrounding the village: new development will only erode into this space.

Actions

Additional Open Space should be sought for the village through the Site Allocations DPD.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space may attract anti-social behaviour. 	
---	--

QUESTION 8a

Do you agree that the prison should remain as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt?

66 responses received

Yes - 53 responses

No - 12 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents agreed with this but a number were unsure what this question meant or the implications of the designation. The majority agreed that the prison should stay but there should be a greater control of development with no further expansion.</p> <p>Those who did not agree gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A definition of Major Developed Sites should be provided. • It should not have been built on Green Belt. • The prison is big enough: no further development of the site should be allowed. • If it involves expansion, this would cause more traffic around the village. • It would also be detrimental to the local wildlife and landscape views. 	<p>The prison should remain as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.</p>

QUESTION 8b

Do you agree that Bovingdon Brickworks should remain as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt?

66 responses received

Yes - 59 responses

No - 7 responses

Response**Actions**

The majority of respondents agreed with this but again there was some uncertainty as to the implications of the designation. The majority agreed that it should remain as it is a local employer but it should not be intensified to the detriment of the village environment. There should be no increase of traffic through the village and no further development in the Green Belt.

Bovingdon Brickworks should remain a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.

Those who did not agree gave the following reasons:

- The Brickworks are big enough. More development would ruin the open countryside.
- The Brickworks should be exempt from the Green Belt.
- This is not a major developed site but an area which supports much wildlife and biodiversity.

QUESTION 9A

Do you think a small supermarket would be better located in the centre of the village?

70 responses received.

Yes - 19 responses

No - 50 responses

Response**Actions**

The majority of respondents, including the Parish Council, did not agree with this because there is no need for an additional supermarket in the village. There are already two in the village centre along with other shops that serve the majority of their needs. A new chain store would impact on the village identity and possibly put small local independent shops out of business. It could also increase traffic congestion along the High Street.

Those who did agree stated that it would maintain the existing retail structure but agreed only on the grounds that no additional supermarket is provided. The village is already well served and does not require any further retail shops of this type.

The strategy will refer to delivering a range of local shops, services and facilities.

QUESTION 9b

Do you think a small supermarket would be better located at the ex-Jaguar garage site?

71 responses received.

Yes - 6 responses

No - 64 responses

Response	Actions
<p>There was even less support for a small supermarket located on this site. Many of the same reasons were given as under Question 9a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village already has enough shops. It would put existing local retailers out of business. • It would have a negative effect on the village dragging retail trade from the High Street. • It would increase traffic and parking problems and reduce highway safety. • The site is located at a busy, dangerous junction. • Planning permission has already been refused for a supermarket on this site. • This is a brownfied sites and should be used to serve a better purpose – e.g. residential, a car park to ease congestion, petrol station. • This is the gateway to the village and should have a building on it which will enhance the village. A Tesco store is out of scale and not in keeping with the village character. <p>Those who did think a small supermarket should be located on this site thought it would bring healthy competition and affordable produce for people who currently drive outside of the village for their shopping. It is located far enough from the centre to avoid congestion or cause too much of a threat to the existing shops in the centre.</p>	<p>The strategy will refer to delivering a range of local shops, services and facilities. The development of a Tesco supermarket here will be resolved through the planning application/appeal process.</p>

QUESTION 10

Are there any other ways to improve the economic prosperity of Bovingdon?

57 responses received

Yes - 41 responses

No - 16 responses

Response

Actions

One respondent did not think that improving economic prosperity was a priority and one considered the wording implied that a decision in favour of a new supermarket has been made. This would unbalance or destroy the current economic prosperity of existing businesses and shops in the High Street and should not be proposed.

Take forward existing strategy for economic development and remove the reference to Bovingdon Market.

Suggestions include:

- Making more use of the airfield – providing a sports facility, light aircraft centre, housing, light industrial area or allotments.
- Combining all local sports clubs on the airfield or at Little Hay to free up the space in the village for affordable housing or car parking, allotments or open space.
- Providing a petrol station.
- Protecting the current mix of local shops to maintain the village vibrancy and to keep profits within the local community (no new Tesco supermarket which will offer limited new employment opportunities and not put profits back into the community).
- Attracting more village based businesses and services to sustain the village.
- Encouraging more local employment opportunities – developing small offices/studio units
- Creating more jobs by expanding the leisure, country pursuits and sporting industry and avoiding the need to travel out of the village to access basic fitness and sport facilities.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving parking provision to encourage people to stop and shop in the village, not drive on to Hemel Hempstead. • Allowing further small industrial units by the Brickworks. • Developing the ex-Jaguar site for mixed use – housing, commercial units and retail. • Improving the appearance of the village centre – street architecture and hard landscaping. 	
--	--

QUESTION 11a

Do you agree that we should try to tackle congestion on the High Street through Option 1 (the provision of two small car parks)?	
<p>69 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 34 responses</p> <p>No - 34 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>There was a mixed response to this question.</p> <p>A number of respondents felt that a mix of the two options should be considered.</p> <p>Those who agreed with Option 1 made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the best option. However how will it be possible if there are no sites available? • It should only be provided if suitable sites are available - not on open space. • Some on street parking should be retained. On street 	<p>Do not pursue this option.</p> <p>The aim of tackling congestion and street parking on the High Street will be removed from the vision and picked up through the general strategy for Bovingdon.</p> <p>Ongoing liaison with HCC to pursue a longer-term solution, in the meantime focus on traffic management and encouraging travel by non-car modes.</p>

<p>parking acts as a traffic calming measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It must be free parking. • Footpaths and cycle parking should also be improved to encourage non car use. • There is a car park at Hyde Meadow, which is unused, because there is no access to the High Street. A walking access should be provided to resolve some of the parking issues. • Parking should be provided on the proposed Tesco site. • The memorial hall should be replaced with a new purpose built community centre on the airfield or at Little Hay, which would free up this site for parking. • The church car park is under utilised. <p>Those who did not support this option gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The car parks will not be used, if they are not centrally located. • There are no sites available. • The present parking at the shops is a positive characteristic - limiting parking encourages more people to walk to the shops and improves vibrancy in the community. • The on street parking slows traffic through the village improving safety. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>The Parish Council are not convinced there are significant congestion problems but would welcome further discussion and information on the issue.</p>	<p>It may be possible to identify local parking opportunities through dual use or a redevelopment scheme in the future as part of the general strategy.</p>
--	---

QUESTION 11b

Do you agree we should try and tackle congestion on the High Street through Option 2 (the control of on street parking)?

62 responses received.

Yes - 18 responses

No - 44 responses

Response

Actions

Again, a number of respondents would like to see a combination of the two options considered not just an either/or. Those who agreed with Option 2 made the following comments:

- Decreasing congestion will increase speed and could increase accidents.
- This will tackle the problem of illegal parking on the pavements.
- It will improve the appearance of the High Street, provide a more organised parking system and will stop people parking inconsiderably.
- It is less costly than Option 1.
- It does not involve new car parks and maintains close links with the shops.

Those who did not agree with Option 2 gave the following reasons:

- The present parking at the shops is a positive characteristic - limiting parking encourages more people to walk to the shops and improves vibrancy in the community.
- Better parking will not reduce congestion. Currently the staggered parking acts as traffic calming.
- Reducing parking and flexibility may damage retail trade. If too strict it will reduce the number of quick 'drop-in' shoppers, which account for a significant

Do not pursue this option.

The aim of tackling congestion and street parking on the High Street will be removed from the vision and picked up through the general strategy for Bovingdon.

Ongoing liaison with HCC to pursue a longer-term solution, in the meantime focus on traffic management and encouraging travel by non-car modes.

<p>number of visits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting parking will just move the problem to surrounding residential streets. • This will not help congestion. • Double yellow lines will impact on the character and would be unfair to some of the shops. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>The Parish Council is not convinced there are significant congestion problems, but would welcome further discussion and information on the issue.</p> <p>HCC Highways says that this option may affect the operation of bus services – i.e. cars may hinder buses rejoining traffic or impeded the use of bus stops.</p>	
--	--

QUESTION 11c

Is there any other way of tackling congestion on the High Street?	
<p>59 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 44 responses</p> <p>No - 14 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>A number of suggestions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine the two options. • Restrict delivery hours or provide dedicated delivery parking. • Provide off road parking for residential units which currently use the High Street to park. • Reduce the speed limit though the High Street. • A lot of traffic is through traffic to the market. 	<p>The aim of tackling congestion and street parking on the High Street will be removed from the vision and picked up through the general strategy for Bovingdon.</p> <p>Ongoing liaison with HCC to pursue a longer-term solution, in the</p>

<p>Therefore the option of closing the High Street for access only could be considered, with a bypass to the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocate the fire station, memorial hall, school and library. • Close the market because this does not bring any benefit to the village. • Improve footpaths and cycle parking to encourage non-car use and walking (especially walking to the school). • Restrict parking to one side of the road only. • Turn the ex-Jaguar site into a landscaped car park. • Improve the bus service. • Restrict on road parking during peak hours. • Introduce speed bumps to discourage rat running. • Introduce a one way system through the village. • Pedestrianise the High Street. • Do not build any more houses or a supermarket in the village which will only bring in more cars. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>HCC Highways suggest an option would be to implement measures to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport, in conjunction with parking control. Access by foot and cycle needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>meantime focus on traffic management and encouraging travel by non-car modes.</p> <p>It may be possible to identify local parking opportunities through dual use or a redevelopment scheme in the future as part of the general strategy.</p>
--	--

QUESTION 12

When future housing development comes forward we may have to choose between the delivery of affordable housing, additional open space or additional leisure space for the village. Should affordable housing be given greater priority over open space / leisure space?

72 responses received

Yes - 15 responses

No - 56 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not think affordable housing should be given greater priority. There was a variety of reasons:

- Equal priority should be given to all three (this was also the view of the Parish Council).
- More open/leisure space is needed now for the current population. This should be tackled first before adding more people.
- More affordable housing will only increase open space and leisure needs.
- Leisure provision, especially for the young, should be given first priority.
- It is important to keep Bovingdon and surrounding areas “green” to maintain the village character.
- Neither housing nor open space is required.
- There are enough affordable houses in the village.

Those who thought affordable housing should be given greater priority gave the following proviso:

- Any large housing development must also include open space and facilities which will benefit the whole village.

Housing and open space to be taken forward as equally important requirements.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing must be spread within open market houses. 	
--	--

QUESTION 13

The spatial strategy for Bovingdon to 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall do you support the strategy?

66 responses received

Yes - 50 responses

No - 15 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents supported the strategy with the following comments raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strategy appears to contradict itself – expanding the village will not keep it compact. How can building more homes reduce traffic congestion or create open space. No large housing sites are needed (as referred to in section b(ii)). New development options should be reviewed. Infrastructure and amenities should be addressed first – i.e. sport, recreation, open space, traffic, parking and schooling. Affordable housing with open space is not supported. The building at the junction of Hemel Hempstead Road and the High Street should not be redeveloped for a supermarket because this will not protect or enhance the historic environment. The site could be used for affordable housing. Traffic congestion should be the top priority. <p>Those who did not support the strategy gave the following</p>	<p>Take the strategy forward.</p>

reasons:

- Bovingdon works well as it is – no strategy is required.
- The level of housing should be reconsidered and all reference to greenfield sites deleted.
- More emphasis should be placed on improving the High Street and making better use of this land – moving out of date/inadequate facilities and using that space for uses more in line with current and future needs e.g. fire station, memorial hall, ex-Jaguar garage, chip shop/Co-op, combining leisure facilities.
- Greater focus should be placed on improving facilities for existing residents before further development is considered.
- No more affordable houses should be provided; the village is already overstretched.
- Greater emphasis should be made on transforming the airfield into a thriving village resource with open space, playing fields and housing.
- The strategy must make clear that greenfield sites will not be despoiled while there are so many ugly brownfield sites in the village.
- There is no land available to expand the primary school.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways outline the importance of the continuing vitality of smaller urban areas in terms of their services/facilities in order to reduce the need to travel. There will still be a need to travel further afield and bus routes are limited. In general the use of more sustainable modes of transport should be encouraged.

QUESTION 14

Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Bovingdon?

62 responses received

Yes - 44 responses

No - 18 responses

Response

Actions

A number of concerns or comments were raised:

Concerns:

- If not enough affordable housing, leisure and sport facilities are provided young people will move away. The youth must be provided for.
- A new supermarket will have a significant impact on the village.
- The school cannot support the children additional housing will create.
- The village will lose its function if business and services are closed and redeveloped for housing. Local business and services need to be supported.
- Too much development will turn Bovingdon from a village into an extension of Hemel Hempstead: greater emphasis should be placed on Bovingdon as a village.
- Meeting Government targets will be given priority over villagers concerns and retaining the Green Belt.
- Bovingdon Airfield must remain as an area of open space, perhaps with allotments.

Comments:

- The Council must plan for the future needs of Bovingdon inhabitants, especially for the rising elderly population with easy access to the High Street, health and community facilities.
- More 2/3 bedrooms houses should be provided, not

Maintain liaison with HCC to bottom out schooling requirements to 2031.

Pick up issues on the environment, community infrastructure and housing in the general strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Consider alternative housing options.

the large 4/5 bedroom houses that have recently been built.

- The Parish Council must be more involved.
- The airfield should accommodate some small industrial units to provide local employment.
- New development should not take the form of the Moody Estate, which is tightly packed with small garages.
- There should not be one major development of 150 units. New development should be spread throughout the village and phased over 25 years so that the infrastructure can cope.
- A multifunctional community centre should be provided on the gateway site to show Bovingdon is a forward looking, caring community.
- More emphasis should be given to the historic environment – i.e. the listed buildings (particularly Bull Cottage) and areas of archaeological interest (Bury Farm, St Lawrence Church and Church Street).
- Consideration should be given to other development sites for housing:
 - land owned by Mr Bateman with access onto Chipperfield Road.
 - ex-Jaguar site.
 - Hyde Meadows car park and council garages in front.
 - Molyneaux Avenue site.
 - Bovingdon Airfield.
- Para 1.8 states the village has no wildlife sites but the strategy later states the Brickworks has an important wildlife site.
- Could the strategy consider improving access to the surrounding countryside?

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Parish Council would like the potential urban capacity to be reinvestigated. It considers that the sites identified could deliver more housing than the 68 units anticipated. With household sizes declining, a higher proportion of

smaller houses are required, thereby suggesting higher densities on identified sites. A number of potentially available sites seem to have been omitted from the analysis.

The Parish Council also considers that the former Harding's Garage site, although within the Green Belt, should be brought forward for housing because this is already previously developed land. This, alongside the revised urban capacity, should be able to accommodate the 130 dwellings needed as identified by HCC.

Hertfordshire Police Authority does not object to development. However it wishes to ensure that financial contributions are obtained to help support the Police Service and that developments are designed to be secure.

HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead?

98 responses received

Yes - 76 responses

No - 20 responses

Response

The majority of respondents agreed with the vision subject to the following provisos:

- The minimum housing target should be removed. The number proposed should relate more closely to the emerging RSS.
- The vision should be flexible enough to be able to deal with increased housing requirements or respond to local factors.
- Specific reference should be made to regeneration of the town centre.
- Town centre parking provision should be retained to keep shops viable – people visiting on bus and bike will not sustain them.
- The town centre should be the main focus for development and regeneration. Further retail expansion outside the town centre, as suggested in the vision, would be contrary to the sequential approach embodied in PS6 and the emerging PPS4.
- Reference of ‘covered bus station’ is unnecessarily prescriptive.
- Local centres should be renewed and a greater range of shops promoted.

Actions

Take forward the vision. Emphasise the need for the regeneration of the town centre and expansion of Maylands Business Park. Housing targets will be tested further.

- There will need to be more schools and a new hospital, if there are more houses.
- A definition of 'high quality houses', including whether they will contain renewable generation technologies, should be provided..
- The following principles should be adhered to:
 - re-establish economic confidence;
 - provide suitable infrastructure;
 - promote the sustainable use of natural resources; and - promote diversity.
- Sustainability targets should be subject to viability testing, which may affect the delivery of regeneration.
- What is written should be a concrete policy not just a vision.

Those who did not agree with the vision suggested the following points should be different:

- The vision ignores the massive undersupply of affordable housing. There should be a Green Belt review around Hemel Hempstead to accommodate more affordable housing and to recognise the need for flexibility and contingency in the housing land supply.
- On the other hand, the delivery of 6,500 dwellings within the urban area is questioned. Evidence is required to demonstrate the identified housing supply is available and achievable. Justification for the inclusion of windfall sites is also needed.
- Hemel Hempstead has already been overdeveloped compared with surrounding towns. Development should be proportionally spread.
- Not so much development should be focused around Buncefield.
- The vision should prioritise bringing previously developed land into efficient use.
- Development of primary schools, which were closed during the County Council's recent review, will add to

the demand for school places. Is it therefore realistic to include these sites as housing sites.

- Encouraging additional business and leisure uses in out of centre retail locations is contrary to PPS6 and should be replaced with wording requiring a sequential approach
- Reference to the conservation and enhancement of the town's rich industrial heritage, particularly Apsley Paper industry, should be included
- A new hospital should be in the vision. It was promised in 1947. A new hospital will provide employment and health for people in the area.
- Green wedges which form an important element of the structure and character of the town should be protected and replicated as part of the development of new housing areas (says the Council's Parks and Open Space Officer).
- Access and parking around Bunkers Park should be improved.
- Sports pitches located at Bunkers Park are not compatible with the current wildlife zone designation or transport and access issues.
- Policy regarding renewable energy generation should read: 'development should make exemplar BREEAM standards subject to financial viability'
- Maintaining the Green Belt gap between Hemel and Kings Langley and the wooded edge of Shendish should be a clear purpose.

One response said the vision should be more ambitious.

Another (for the Crown Estate) says that the town should be the focus for growth, in particular the east side of the town.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Herts Biological Records Centre would like to see more reference to biodiversity and the importance of the two river systems running Hemel Hempstead in creating wildlife corridors. Reference to the natural environment should be

made within the vision which is consistent with a 'more beautiful' approach to the town.

The Environment Agency has a similar view and also says that the rivers should also be shown on Figure 1.1. The Chilterns Conservation Board agrees.

British Waterways agree with the vision but would like to see more on the possibilities of an improved "blue green area" south of the town centre.

The Chilterns Conservation Board wants to see reference to the proximity of the AONB and the effect of increased demand for water: existing water supplies are overstretched.

Hertfordshire Police Authority says the vision does not provide for the delivery of sustainable development through the provision of crime-free and safe environments.

QUESTION 2

Are there any additional key issues we should be considering?

84 responses received

Yes - 61 responses

No - 23 responses

Response

Actions

A number of issues were raised:

Housing:

- Maximising housing provision from acceptable sources.
- Identifying a range of suitable housing sites to meet

Progress other work. A range of sites is being identified in the Site Allocations DPD.

<p>affordable and open market housing needs, including land at Marchmont Farm and land at West Hemel Hempstead/Pouchen End.</p> <p><i>Infrastructure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting the infrastructure in place first – needs are currently not being met. Schools, improved libraries and a 24 hour police facility is needed. • Hemel Hempstead Hospital needs to be reinstated and enlarged. Facilities at Watford and St Albans will not be able to support this growth. <p><i>Transport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting sustainable modes of transport and renewable technologies. • Improving cycle paths, public transport, access to the train station and town centre parking. • Tackling traffic congestion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in and around Maylands and Leverstock Green; and - in Apsley. <p><i>Retail:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A heading, “Retail,” should be added. • Issues include attracting more, quality retailers into the area, improving the range of provision in the town centre <p>and reclaiming trade and expenditure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give priority to improving the town centre for retail, entertainment and leisure uses, not out of town locations. • Re-instalment of the old style market area. <p><i>Environment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancing all the gateways into Hemel Hempstead including Two Waters. • Maintaining Hemel Hempstead as a green place with trees and open space. • Improving what we already have, including the old 	<p>The Council will liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough. The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation and Delivery Plan will provide an audit of the infrastructure required.</p> <p>Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs & Facilities.</p> <p>Take forward retail issues under Strengthening Economic Prosperity: Supporting Retail and Commerce.</p> <p>Take forward environmental issues under Looking After the Environment.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Study will be delivered to help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p> <p>Note link between development and flight paths.</p> <p>Refer to cross boundary issues and appropriate housing development options.</p>
---	---

housing stock. Organic development is preferred to large planned developments.

- Preserving the Green Belt for biodiversity, leisure, food and biomass production.
- Water issues and overcrowding.
- Improving the existing standards of living and community well-being in specific estates such as Grovehill and Woodhall Farm.
- The historical legacies of John Dickinson's and other early factories should be emphasised as part of the sense of place, as well as conserving and enhancing access to the canal.
- Maximising food security by supporting land use for food.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Environment Agency:

- The remediation of land contamination through previous use.

London Luton Airport Operations Limited:

- The effect of development on Luton Airport. Development should not prejudice the expansion of the airport envisaged in the White paper on the Future of Air Transport. The allocation of development sites must take into account existing and future flight paths.

Entec (for the Crown Estate):

- The proposed housing numbers [6,500 dwellings] are too low to support a town that is a key centre for development and change. There is no mention of strategic housing sites.
- The regional plan does not preclude local Green Belt reviews.
- There is no reference to market housing.
- There needs to be a reference to cross boundary issues with St Albans Council (e.g. relocation of uses from Maylands).

QUESTION 3

Do you agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead town centre?

81 responses received

Yes - 65 responses

No - 16 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents agreed with the vision subject to the following provisos:

- A new acute hospital should be provided as well as facilities for the elderly and mental health.
- New buildings should use renewable energy.
- Cycle routes should be planned throughout the town.
- Residential use should not be referred to as ancillary: it forms an integral part of the town centre.
- High quality architecture should be promoted. However not every building will be able to be 'outstanding' nor would it be appropriate for that.
- Reference should be made to public realm and open space.
- Development should contribute towards the cost of new or improved infrastructure, including the police service.
- Development should incorporate the identity of Hemel Hempstead not repeat a 'could be anywhere' riverside development.
- It should be an opportunity to restore G Jellicoe's vision.

Take forward the vision, in particular focussing on how to regenerate the town centre.

Prepare a Town Centre Masterplan.

Those who did not agree with the vision suggested the following points should be different:

- An art/photographic exhibition space in or near the Performing Arts Centre should be included. There is

<p>currently no facility and it would be in keeping with the historical links with Kodak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate reference to the much needed theatre. • It should align more closely with RSS policy which supports a wider range of uses including education. • An adult learning centre should be incorporated. • The word 'shop' should be included in the first sentence between 'live and work'. • The area now occupied by the college should be parkland: no more housing is needed or wanted in the centre. • Land for the hospital should be retained on Hillfield Road and used to replace the hospital. 	
---	--

QUESTION 4a

Do you agree with all of the spatial principles in Policy X?

76 responses received

Yes - 57 responses

No - 18 responses

Response

The majority of respondents agreed with all of the spatial principles in Policy X. A few comments were made:

- More emphasis should be placed on green spaces to prevent the town centre feeling claustrophobic.
- Improvements to the public realm will be required in the short/medium term in the Marlowes Shopping Centre Zone.
- A theatre should be mentioned.
- If car access is restricted, people will travel elsewhere.
- A measure of the centre's success needs to be

Actions

Take forward the spatial principles to help guide the future use, movement and design of development in the town centre.

established.

- Core strategies have to be deliverable in different economic conditions. This could require a different approach to bringing forward large scale town centre regeneration schemes.
- The extent of the Plough Zone is unclear.

Those who did not agreed with all of the spatial principles gave the following reasons:

- The Plough roundabout should be made a key landmark.
- Housing in the town centre will disadvantage the old town even further.
- The Hospital Zone should contain a decent hospital.
- Good parking is needed, as well as integrated transport.
- The town will not survive if people have to rely on public transport. People will travel elsewhere.
- Parking for disabled persons and helpers is needed.
- The area from the Old Town to the Plough should be pedestrianised and Leighton Buzzard Road upgraded to a dual carriageway.
- There is no mention of the history of the New Town – or old town – or how the new streetscape will enhance existing elements, e.g. the villas in Marlowes and buildings in the Old Town.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways consider that an effective parking strategy will be necessary in conjunction with improved passenger transport, walking and cycling facilities. Careful consideration should be given to the design of any traffic calming on bus routes, if the road is to remain conducive to bus use. To encourage more cycling traffic management will be important and additional cycle parking may need be needed.

QUESTION 4b**Do you agree with part (i) (Focus)?****61 responses received****Yes - 54 responses****No - 7 responses****Response**

The majority of respondents agreed with part (i). It was suggested that reference to a place of worship, perhaps ecumenical, be included as a way of helping integrate people as well as meet religious aspirations. West Herts College supports reference to education as a key activity in the town centre.

Only one respondent put forward a reason for not agreeing with part (i): a housing estate is not appropriate in the centre of the town.

Actions

Carry forward principles guiding the future use and development.

QUESTION 4c**Do you agree with part (ii) (Sense of place)?****60 responses received****Yes - 51 responses****No - 9 responses****Response**

The majority of respondents agreed with part (ii). A few provisos were made:

- Greater priority should be given to

Actions

Carry forward principles guiding the future design of development.

<p>pedestrians/cycling. Lighting must be provided so people feel safe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a distinctive sense of place within each character zone should take into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how to fit with existing poor quality buildings; and - how to enhance the existing 'tired' environment <p>This consideration should not unduly delay bringing forward the town centre proposals.</p> <p>Those who did not agree with part (ii) gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will encourage segregation. • There is no place for car owners to park their cars. • Creating a sense of place involves more than just great design. It is linked to the feeling of safety and security, and the suitability of an area for families at all hours. • Places for people to meet, greet and relax in, not just move through, are also important. • The policy should expand on links with the New Town history in the vision. 	
---	--

QUESTION 4d

Do you agree with part (iii) (Integrated transport)?	
<p>62 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 49 responses</p> <p>No - 13 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents agreed with part (iii). A few provisos or issues were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety is paramount; places must be well lit to encourage walkers. 	<p>Carry forward principles guiding future movement and development.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A park and ride facility needs to be secured. • How can this be enforced when the Council does not own the bus company? • This should be linked to new bus routes from the east side of the town and park and ride facilities there. <p>Those who did not agree with part (iii) gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To achieve this objective a more extensive and regular bus network is needed in outlying estates such as Grovehill and Woodhall Farm. • Limiting car parks will mean more people will just drive to Watford or elsewhere to do their shopping. • Extra parking will be needed to accommodate extra visitors and to maintain an influx of shoppers to the centre. 	
--	--

QUESTION 4e

Do you agree with part (iv)(Environment)?	
<p>60 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 51 responses</p> <p>No - 9 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents agreed with part (iv). A few provisos or comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new bullet point should be added: 'Integrate improvements with existing areas, such as the pedestrianised Marlowes, in order to benefit both Riverside and Waterhouse Square areas'. • The river should be properly integrated into the design, not put at the rear as before. Its importance to biodiversity should be highlighted and ecological 	<p>Carry forward principles guiding the future movement and design of development.</p> <p>Design and construction issues will be taken forward under Looking After the Environment.</p>

<p>improvements secured.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should not delay the bringing forward of the town centre proposals. • Sustainability targets should be subject to viability testing (because it could add to costs affecting the delivery of regeneration). <p>Those who did not agree with part (iii) gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why create a new riverside walk when the Water Gardens has been allowed to fall into disrepair? • The Council should not waste any more money on public art: the town centre and gateway have too much already. <p>The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer recommends the following principles in part (iv):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to extend the naturalisation of the River Gade; • to improve the sustainability of the River Gade through the town centre corridor; • to restore historic features and green spaces within and next to the town centre; and • to improve pedestrian connections between the zones and entrance ways to Gadebridge Park. 	
---	--

QUESTION 5a

Do you agree with all of Policy Y (town centre character zones)?	
66 responses received	
Yes - 39 responses	
No - 26 responses	
Response	Actions

The majority of respondents agreed with Policy Y subject to a few provisos:

- The original character of the Old Town should be preserved.
- More trees should be planted to soften the hard edge of the Marlowes.
- The replacement Civic Centre/Arts venue should be of a design that fits in, not the illustrative 'birds nest'.
- Museums and an education complex are important facilities to include.
- Flexibility of approach is required to be able to respond to site specific conditions and up-to-date assessments of need, supply and demand, which is important in the current economic climate.

Those who did not agree with Policy Y gave the following reasons:

- More emphasis should be made on improvements to the range and quality of the shops.
- The Plough roundabout puts Hemel Hempstead 'on the map' and should not be changed.
- The delivery of the Waterhouse Square proposals will be difficult to achieve in the current economic climate. The plans need to be revised taking in a longer time scale.
- There is concern with the increased growth but reduced hospital facilities. The hospital should not be relocated to Maylands.
- The infrastructure cannot support all the potential new homes in the area.
- Re-siting a surgery to Apsley should be reconsidered. Traffic between the town centre and Apsley is bad at certain times of the day. Movement should be considered together with improvements to parking and transport links.
- No housing should be located here, particularly 1 and 2 bedroom flats, which the town has enough of.
- Waterhouse Square should be a green place with minimum concrete.
- Geoffrey Jellicoe's design and vision for the town centre and Gadebridge Park should contribute to or

Update the town centre character zones to more accurately reflect character in the town centre and development opportunities.

be utilized in the design of Waterhouse Square and other parts of the town centre.	
--	--

QUESTION 5b

Do you agree with the aims for the Waterhouse Square Zone?	
<p>73 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 62 responses</p> <p>No - 9 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The vast majority of respondents agreed with the aims for this zone with the following provisos made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be space for art and photographic exhibitions within or near the performing arts centre. • An adult learning centre should be incorporated. • Homes should be built using renewable technologies. • New shops are acceptable. • Any retail floorspace within the scheme should be complementary to the existing town centre offer. • The Water Gardens should be restored. • The retention/relocation/redevelopment of the Court facility should be considered an essential criterion in negotiations with development partners in carrying forward the regeneration of this area. • Reference to the acceptability of retailing should be provided. <p>Those who disagreed gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why should the new civic offices be located in the middle of town? Maylands is an alternative location. • Other than a new Pavilion, the rest is unnecessary. 	<p>Subdivide this zone to reflect viable future development options.</p>

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways recognise the need to redevelop the bus station and upgrade facilities to make it a more attractive option to use as well as improving pedestrian and cycle links within the scheme.

The Chilterns Conservation Board supports the enhancement of the River Gade but wants it to return to a more natural chalk stream.

QUESTION 5c

Do you agree with the aims for the Old Town Zone?

64 responses received

Yes - 54 responses

No - 10 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents agreed with the aims for this zone, provided the character of the area is not changed.

Those who disagreed were concerned that any changes or improved links with the town would impact on the character of this unique part of Hemel Hempstead. It would be better to consider banning the use of private cars in this area instead.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways support the improvement of pedestrian and cycle links, if proposals for new homes come forward. As a negative point, the relocation of health uses would mean

Extend the zone to include the properties to the north-east of the Marlowes. This is to help integrate any future development on the College site with the Old Town.

that local residents would have to travel further for such facilities.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer points out that the: Old Town Zone includes a small part of Gadebridge Park: this also needs improving as part of the overall scheme.

QUESTION 5d

Do you agree with the aims for the Hospital Zone?	
<p>68 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 31 responses</p> <p>No - 37 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>There was less agreement with the aims for this zone. The majority do not want to see the loss of the hospital from its current centralised location. Other reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be given to improving the hospital on the current site and reinstating all the existing services. This will be more cost effective than relocating it at Maylands or elsewhere. • The policy currently reads '<i>If</i> a new local community hospital....' It should read "when". • It is not appropriate to locate housing next to an industrial site. <p>Those who agree with the aims for the zone gave the following provisos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New houses should not be built. • The closure of the hospital is not acceptable especially with the increase in number of houses and people proposed. • Money spent on relocating the hospital should instead be put into upgrading the existing one. 	<p>Amend zone boundaries to include the offices, hotel and surgery along Park Lane. It will also include Paradise Fields. The Council's supports the retention and/or development of hospital facilities in the zone.</p>

Comments from Key Organisations:

Herts Biological records Centre raised concern about the effect on Paradise Fields. Paradise Fields contain wildlife corridors, which are botanically valuable, with good butterfly populations, reaching Wildlife Site status.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer asks that the design of the area is sympathetic to its location next to Paradise Fields, and good access is provided.

QUESTION 5e

Do you agree with the aims for the Original Marlowes Zone?

60 responses received

Yes - 47 responses

No - 12 responses

Response

The majority of respondents agreed with the aims for this zone. It was suggested that the Council should consider protecting buildings of local importance, which add value to the street scene, as well as the villas.

Those who disagreed either:

- asked where will the new residential buildings would be located; or
- requested a complete rethink.

Actions

Carry forward.

QUESTION 5f

Do you agree with the aims for the Marlowes Shopping Zone?

54 responses received

Yes - 41 responses

No - 12 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents agreed with the aims for this zone, provided plaques from the competition 'Paving the Way' are integrated into the new design.

Extend the Marlowes Shopping Zone northwards. It will be a focal point for regeneration and should include more of the shopping area.

Those who disagreed aims made the following comments:

- This area is a complete disaster with limited appeal and needs a complete rethink. It needs to be made more interesting for shoppers with more variety and more original shops.
- It is not large enough.
- It should all be under cover.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways recognise the importance of ensuring the town centre remains attractive for local residents in order to reduce the need to travel further afield.

QUESTION 5g**Do you agree with the aims for the Plough Zone?****57 responses received****Yes - 45 responses****No - 9 responses****Response****Actions**

The majority of respondents agreed with the aims for this zone with the following provisos made:

- Another pedestrian route needs to be provided because the underpass frequently floods.
- A more interesting shopping parade or shops should be provided.
- Text should include: 'Retain and enhance the Riverside area as an important shopping facility for the town centre'.

Those who disagreed considered it was too late to comment because most of the buildings/development are new and the Plough roundabout should be recognised as a key landmark.

Acknowledge the significance of the Riverside Scheme.

QUESTION 6

Is there anything else that should be incorporated into the ‘Looking after the environment theme’ for Hemel Hempstead?

63 responses received

Yes - 40 responses

No - 23 responses

Response

Actions

A number of suggestions or comments were made:

- A fresh look at the town is needed to bring it more up market.
- New development can bring benefits, enhancing the overall environment through high quality design
- The history and design of the 1947 New Town needs to be considered alongside the history of the Old Town when formulating environmental policies.
- All new and old buildings should be carbon neutral, incorporating the best energy saving features.
- Cycle and pedestrian routes should be improved and more accessible.
- Open areas and trees should be retained to ensure Hemel Hempstead stays as a countryside town and coalescence with surrounding areas is avoided.
- Trees must be managed to avoid blocking lights, drains and damaging properties.
- The statement is very general and inflexible. It should focus on key strategic views. The provision of open space and possible wildlife corridors should be judged on the merits of each case.

Take the basic approach for ‘looking after the environment’ will be taken forward and developed to help enhance the natural environment, conserve the historic environment and use resources efficiently.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Environment Agency:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater emphasis should be placed on sustainable development. <p>Herts Biological Records Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paradise Fields is a significant ecological resource and must be considered as part of the wildlife corridor/open space resource (and therefore included within the Green Space Strategy). <p>The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability of the River Gade and enhancement of the corridor is not included. <p>Entec for the Crown Estate welcome reference to the green energy centre and the possibility of a link with development in the area.</p>	
--	--

QUESTION 7

Do you support a viable town stadium complex?	
<p>65 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 48 responses</p> <p>No - 16 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents supported this subject to the following proviso:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is viable and would be used so as to become a positive feature. • It is of an appropriate size for its use and function, larger than Jarmans but relatively modest, and perhaps shared with St Albans. • It is used for sports, not greyhound racing or other 	<p>Take forward within East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan.</p>

use.

- Transport links need to be improved to reduce car travel.
- The stadium is sensitively sited not affecting key views across the Green Belt or encroaching on the space between St Albans, Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead to retain the distinctive nature of each community.

Concern was raised regarding the proposed location being away from the train station because people would not be able to walk to it from there. A dedicated bus service would be needed to avoid increased car use and congestion, which would not be in line with the 'green/environmentally friendly' vision proposed.

Those who said 'No' gave the following reasons:

- Land is restricted in the area.
- It would not contribute to or enhance the town in a positive way.
- There are concerns about funding.
- A stadium complex would not be viable for a small place such as Hemel Hempstead.
- There would be restricted access and space for parking, road safety, and major traffic disruption would result.
- There are no supporting facilities such as police, security or an A&E hospital.
- The town already has facilities at Jarmans and the stadium at Watford is within easy reach. There is a greater need for a new arts centre since the demolition of the Pavilion.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Sport England supports the principles of a stadium on the assumption that it is viable and clear need has been demonstrated within a feasibility study.

Entec for the Crown Estate supports the principle and location of the stadium. It considers that for the stadium to

be successful it should be planned as part of an integrated development of new neighbourhoods.

QUESTION 8

Is there anything else in addition to that outlined that should be incorporated into the social and personal welfare theme for Hemel Hempstead?

63 responses received

Yes - 33 responses

No - 29 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents reiterated the need for the following facilities:

- ensuring sufficient community sites and infrastructure are in place to cater for the expanding population
- a theatre or concert hall
- more facilities for people of all ages, including improved youth facilities to keep them off the streets and facilities for the elderly
- a cultural centre
- a hospital.

Other suggestions include:

- improved transport links to rural areas
- improved library facilities
- mental health facilities
- art/photography exhibition space
- an adult education centre - a college which gears its self to local businesses
- improved police facilities and policing

Consider the need for Social Infrastructure further. Guidance will be given on the development of new facilities, alongside an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and advice on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

- a bingo hall (people currently travel to Watford)
- community facilities on land at the Manor Estate
- a multicultural centre in Waterhouse Square [The reference to one in point 5.2 is confusing and should be removed.]
- conserving Frogmore Mill, together with the heritage of the paper industry.

It is also important to provide for a mix of housing types and tenures to meet the needs of all of the local community

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways highlight the need to incorporate plans for bus service provision and quality pedestrian and cycle access for all new large scale developments in order to improve accessibility to local services, jobs and facilities.

Boxmoor Trust:

- The Trust's proposed HQ/heritage centre and wetland centre should also be mentioned.

Entec for the Crown Estate:

- The findings of the SHMA (housing market assessment) are crucial to understanding the future type and mix of housing: there should not be an undue reliance on flats (for example in the town centre).
- New neighbourhoods, with appropriate facilities, should provide for at least 1,500 dwellings. Land can be made available (east of the town) for this.

QUESTION 9

Should Jarman Fields be redesignated as an out of centre retail and leisure designation?

74 responses received

Yes - 52 responses

No - 22 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents supported this redesignation provided the facilities currently available for young people are not taken away. It was considered that the leisure facilities should be upgraded and enhanced but the retail provision was given less support because this takes retailers away from the town and local centres.

Jarman Fields should be redesignated as an out of centre retail and leisure designation.

Representations made on behalf of Tesco's and Leisure World objected to the proposed designation. Jarman Fields should be classified as a district centre:

- to reflect its importance in the existing retail hierarchy (as recognised within the adopted Local Plan); and
- to ensure that its role and function is maintained and protected for the benefit of local residents.

Others who said 'No' gave the following reasons:

- It would take people away from the town centre and local centre shops, and undermine the prosperity of the town centre.
- Traffic congestion will increase in the area.
- Vacant land should be used for the relocation of the police station.
- There are enough out of centre locations. The focus should be on filling existing vacant floorspace, not adding more.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a commercial area and should remain so. • It should remain a leisure designation. • Is Jarmans not already an out of centre retail and leisure park? <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations</i></p> <p>GoEast state that any significant new development at Jarmans Park will need to meet the need and sequential tests set out in the Government’s planning policy statements.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 10

<p>The spatial strategy themes for Hemel Hempstead to 2031 are presented in Section 5. Overall, do you support this approach?</p>	
<p>57 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 42 responses</p> <p>No - 13 responses</p>	
<p>Response</p>	<p>Actions</p>
<p>The majority of respondents supported this approach. Some provisos and issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be at an appropriate density should be developed to retain the existing feel of the settlement and avoid crime. • No mention is made of designated areas for traveller sites. • “Covered bus station” should mean sheltered not enclosed, because the design should ensure no build up of exhaust fumes. • Using Maylands as a park and ride sites seems unviable and unrealistic. Links to the stations should be improved. 	<p>Take forward the approach for the spatial strategy themes.</p>

- A flexible approach should be adopted to allow for up-to-date assessments of need, supply and demand.
- The scope of the strategy may need to be re-examined because housing and Green Belt Issues are affected by the outcome of the reconsideration of the East of England Plan.

Those who did not support this approach gave the following reasons:

- The use of employment areas should not be based on retailing and warehousing. These employment opportunities are too low paid for people to afford to live in the Borough.
- It could involve building on green field sites: more emphasis on using existing brownfield sites is needed.
- More research and engagement with the local community is needed before any decisions should be made.
- Maylands Business Park should not be expanded: no detail of the current land use is provided.
- Maylands should be the focus for employment rather than housing. Housing in this area will not offer good residential amenity.
- There is no planning justification for making Waterhouse Square the subject of a specific sustainability policy/target. Viability is important to the delivery of regeneration projects so policy wording should be amended.
- Economic prosperity also depends upon the Council providing a range of housing sites in and around the town to help meet the demands of different sections of society. This will also help realise the objectives of Maylands because employers will be provided with a certainty that new staff will be able to find suitable accommodation.
- Infrastructure upgrades can only be provided if a number of development locations are identified so improvements can be funded.
- Reference to the 'covered bus station' is too prescriptive and should be replaced by 'bus station' or public transport interchange'.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability is important in the delivery of regeneration. • There is no reference to the need to create sustainable new neighbourhoods or market housing (Crown Estate). • Traffic work confirming the need for the North East Relief Road should be published (Crown Estate). <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>HCC (Hertfordshire Property) generally supports the spatial strategy. However they would like the Council to reconsider the designation of former school sites (currently Open Land) so as not to prejudice future opportunities to meet housing needs.</p> <p>The Highways Agency notes the location of employment development at Maylands and the town centre, and supports the allocation of some housing here to help reduce travel distances.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 11

Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Hemel Hempstead?	
<p>87 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 65 responses</p> <p>No - 22 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>A number of concerns were raised regarding the location of proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites and the omission of reference to this within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Other concerns and comments raised include:</p>	<p>The Core Strategy will include a policy for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to alternative housing</p>

<p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy will lead to overcrowding, reduction in quality of the environment and an increase in crime. • Development in the Green Belt would have a significant impact on existing neighbourhoods, infrastructure and the environment. • Careful consideration should be given to the potential of urban sites to deliver housing. If not, the result would be to create further pressure for Green Belt and greenfield locations to be identified. <p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document is too confusing and beyond the intellectual capacity of some. • The strategy will not be achieved if any development at Marchmont Farm is implemented. This is a well used site for leisure and recreation, with much wildlife. • The strategy should concentrate on improving existing sports and leisure facilities within neighbourhoods rather than provide new ones. • The Gade Valley should be preserved and enhanced, and views protected across the whole valley. • Only public facilities such as the library, performing arts centre and public orientated parts of the Council Offices should be sited within the prime town centre location. All other offices should be relocated to Maylands. • The Nicky Line is a neglected, litter filled corridor, not the wildlife corridor stated in this strategy. • Closing schools and the hospital and then replace them in a different location seems financially questionable. • Consideration should be given to the creation of a new leisure facility to the north of the town to reduce congestion around Jarman Park. • Consideration should be given to the redevelopment of Jarman Park to create new facilities set within an attractive parkland. • Regeneration and expansion of the Maylands Business Park is flawed because it ignores the recommendation of the Buncefield final report. Businesses and workers will not want to go there. It 	<p>options/targets.</p> <p>The need for Social Infrastructure will be considered further. Guidance will be given on the development of new facilities, alongside an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and advice on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.</p> <p>The importance of regenerating the town centre will be emphasised.</p> <p>The need for detailed guidance on urban design and the historic environment will be considered.</p> <p>Guidance will be provided to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enable convenient access between homes, jobs and facilities; • identify biodiversity resources in the borough; • enhance urban design; and • conserve the historic environment.
---	--

should be made into a wildlife reserve.

- The policies as currently drafted do little to address the future recovery of the town centre and the role of planning policy in achieving this recovery.
- Design for the Town should incorporate the principles and vision of Geoffrey Jellicoe.
- The Core Strategy should ensure sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances in the future (in line with advice in PPS12).
- Reference should be made to the importance of Frogmore Mill and the paper making industry should be mentioned.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC has highlighted that improvements in bus service are required to ensure the viability of a park and ride facility, as well as complementary measures. Developer contributions will be required to help fund improved bus services.

Boxmoor Trust would like to see reference to their meadows, watercourses and woodland in the strategy because they represent a significant contribution to accessible natural green space in the town.

St Albans City and District Council has no objection, but wishes to ensure that the East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan confines itself to land within the borough of Dacorum.

The Highways Agency wants to see a reduction in car dependency and impacts on key junctions, such as Junctions 7 and 8 of the M1, minimised. It asks whether traffic modelling for the town includes these junctions, and also comments on proposals in the East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan according to whether they could affect traffic flows on the M1.

Hertfordshire Police Authority generally supports the strategy. However it wishes to ensure that financial contributions are obtained to help support the Police Service (in the form of increased staffing and vehicle/accommodation costs). Developments and

communities should be designed to be secure.	
--	--

KINGS LANGLEY

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the vision for Kings Langley?

63 responses received

Yes - 46 responses

No - 16 responses

Response

The vision for Kings Langley was largely supported. The following comments and provisos were made:

- Local services and transport infrastructure are already overstretched. These should be improved to compensate for the increased number of houses.
- Growth should help to maintain a healthy balance between ages and income brackets to give a viable, diverse and inclusive village. The demographic profile is currently very limited (older, wealthier and retired).
- Kings Langley should be retained and protected as a village environment and any development should be in keeping with its character, this means protecting green space around the village and ensuring future development does not merge with adjoining locations.
- There are already sufficient sports facilities in and around Kings Langley.
- Kings Langley is already overcrowded. New development should be concentrated elsewhere.

Actions

Take the vision forward.
Remove references to outdoor leisure space and the Three Rivers District Council's Core Strategy.

Those who did not agree with the vision suggested the following points should be different:

- More emphasis should be made on local infrastructure, which cannot cope with more growth. The infrastructure must be in place first or the increased population will suffer degradation in their quality of life.
- The focus should not be on providing affordable houses. Kings Langley is a sought after place, where people work hard to get a house. Future occupiers should reflect this.
- The vision has ignored the concerns about coalescence.
- Emphasis should be placed on retaining Kings Langley as a village. The settlement has reached its maximum size as a village and more development will turn it into a town. Development along the boundaries in the Green Belt must be avoided.
- The vision is an ideal and appears unattainable. Development should slow down. More information should be provided on how the culture, history, wildlife and quality of life will be maintained and protected.
- The shops and services in the High Street are not well used or viable and need more promotion to survive.
- The vision is too limited in growth and should be amended to accommodate more growth.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Three Rivers District Council:

- The Council supports the focus of the Core Strategy on aiming to ensure that future development will be as sustainable as possible. It recognises the need to work jointly to plan for the whole of Kings Langley and that some development will be essential to support the vitality of the village.

HCC Highways:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mention of accessibility by sustainable transport modes despite congestion and the condition of footways being identified as a key issue. 	
---	--

QUESTION 2

Are there any other major issues we should be thinking about?	
<p>51 responses received.</p> <p>Yes - 38 responses</p> <p>No - 12 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>A number of issues were raised:</p> <p><i>Infrastructure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the capacity of infrastructure, including water supply, drainage and power: this needs to be increased to be able to support the existing local community and future population; • more, local facilities for the young; • addition to sports facilities an extension of other hobby, leisure and on-going learning opportunities would be beneficial to promote healthier community cohesion and combat tensions between younger and older members of the community; <p><i>Traffic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improvements in public transport, particularly improved links to Watford Hospital, and cycle facilities; • traffic volumes and the capacity of the existing, already congested road network; • parking problems and road safety (particularly 	<p>A range of sites is being identified in the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Pick up environmental issues under the section Looking After the Environment. A Green Infrastructure Study help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p> <p>The Council will liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough.</p> <p>Liaise with Three Rivers District Council and on common issues and co-ordination of policy.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation</p>

<p>Vicarage Lane Junction with the A4251); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the possible inclusion of traffic calming measures along the High Street to slow traffic down and improve safety. <p><i>Environment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> destruction of the village character; protecting the historic landscape around the village; pollution/air quality; drought; loss of Green Belt land and wildlife; and potential loss of farmland. Livestock farming adds to the local distinctiveness of the rural hinterland and is fundamental in retaining the existing character of the countryside. The UK needs to become more self sufficient so need to retain existing farmland. <p><i>Housing and other issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> joint working with Three Rivers Council (housing development in Three Rivers in putting a lot of pressure on the services and facilities in Dacorum); provision of affordable houses for families and the young (so they do not have to move from the village and can continue to support older family members). additional opportunities to optimise the use of urban land to meet housing needs (this would avoid extending into the Green Belt: sites at the Nap, the old telephone exchange, land near Coniston Road and empty garage blocks in Great Park plus Sunderlands Yard could accommodate the majority of the 110 dwellings needed); and the effect of development locations on existing and future flight paths (London Luton Airport Operations Limited says that development should not prejudice proposals in the White Paper on the Future of Air Transport.). 	<p>and Delivery Plan will provide an audit of any infrastructure required.</p> <p>Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs & Facilities.</p> <p>Note link between development and flight paths.</p>
--	---

QUESTION 3

Do you agree with this level of growth?

59 responses received.

Yes - 28 responses

No - 30 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not agree with the level of growth. Most thought this level was too high, for the following reasons:

- The area is already overdeveloped and the local infrastructure cannot support an increased population, particularly since the completion at Ovaltine.
- Development would be unsustainable. The level of growth should be determined by the number of extra people the existing village facilities can support.
- Growth would impact on the village community and character.
- Development should not be at the expense of the Green Belt or risk Kings Langley joining up with Hemel Hempstead or Watford. Future development should be limited to small scale infilling or making more efficient use of brownfield land such as unused employment sites.
- Congested roads cannot cope with more development, which are already congested.
- Green Belt land should not be considered for new development because the Council has reverted to a housing target of 9000 dwellings by 2031: this can be accommodated within the existing settlements.
- More outdoor sports facilities are needed: the open countryside can be used to meet this need.

Take account of proposals in Three Rivers' area. The consequences are that the development of a greenfield site should not be pursued: one housing development option within the boundaries of the village would therefore be appropriate.

Some would support a greater level of growth. Kings Langley is in a sustainable location and can accommodate more growth to increase the potential for affordable houses and the proportion of younger people in the village.

Those who agreed with the level of growth gave the following provisos:

- Development should be kept to a level that the infrastructure can cope with; alternatively, facilities should be improved first.
- Development in the Green Belt should be kept to a minimum.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways does not consider the proposed level of development is large enough to support contributions towards improvements to bus services. It may be more appropriate to seek improvements to pedestrian/cycle routes or bus stop infrastructure to encourage more use of sustainable transport.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society accepts the principle that development should be of a scale to allow the population to remain stable. It queries the level proposed in Dacorum because of the amount put forward in Three Rivers Preferred Options (Feb 2009 – 180 dwellings). It therefore recommends a co-ordinated approach to the planning of Kings Langley between the districts.

QUESTION 4a

Do you prefer Option 1 (Rectory Farm)?

57 responses received.

Yes - 31 responses

No - 25 responses

Response

Actions

The majority preferred Option 1 in comparison with Option 2. The reasons given include:

- The site is well integrated within the main area of Kings Langley.
- There are clear boundaries limiting growth retaining the village as a compact settlement.
- The site has already been built on and feels more like a brownfield site. The current buildings and land are unsightly.
- This is a good location to accommodate affordable housing with access to shops, school, recreation facilities and transport.
- The site has an attractive waterfront location. Mitigation measures could be included to reduce flood risk
- The site is considered to be in reasonably easy walking distance of the train station and the football pitches provide a green buffer.

Some provisos were made:

- Wildlife along the canal should be protected.
- Development should include a roundabout to improve access arrangements.
- Development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing barns to retain the existing village feel. The remainder of the land should become public open space.
- The impact of development on the river valley and wildlife corridor needs to be taken into account as

Do not progress Option 1.

well as the impact on reducing the gap between Hemel Hempstead and Kings Langley. Development should be limited for this reason.

Reasons for rejecting this option include:

- It is Green Belt land which is not needed to support growth. It should not be identified as a contingency option because it could set a precedent and weaken the ability to prevent Green Belt development in the future.
- The reasons for rejecting the proposal by the Inspector during the last local plan enquiry remain. The site was recommended to remain open land to avoid coalescence (although the redevelopment of the existing barns could be considered).
- The site should be developed for leisure use – i.e. expansion of the football club or a park. Open space is needed following other recent high density development in the area (including Ovaltine).
- Development would impact on the character of the village.
- Building should not take place in a floodplain.
- The canal side should be retained as an important wildlife site to protect biodiversity.
- There have already been a large number of canal side developments in the area, impacting on the wildlife along the waterside and integrity of the canal environment.
- Development would impact on local services/ infrastructure and will increase car use as it is too far from the station.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Kings Langley Parish Council:

The Council is opposed to the development of the entire Rectory Farm site to avoid coalescence with Hemel Hempstead. However development on the existing footprint of the barns should be considered. The remainder of the site should be developed as parkland.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would erode the important gap between the village and Hemel Hempstead. <p>HCC Highways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They prefer this option because it is likely that a greater number of houses would be within the recommended distance of 400m to a bus stop. <p>HCC (Hertfordshire Property):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of housing growth is dependent upon the delivery of primary school education. Growth options should not be progressed unless consideration of the planning of the whole settlement confirms that there is capacity within primary schools to support that growth. <p>British Waterways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It prefers Option 1 because it offers the opportunity to secure contributions to improve the towpath in the area. If handled sensitively, this would have no significant impact on the ecological value of the area. 	
--	--

QUESTION 4b

Do you prefer Option 2 (Wayside and Broadfield Farms)?	
<p>50 responses received.</p> <p>Yes - 11 responses</p> <p>No - 39 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>Those in support of Option 2 gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is close to the station and main roads (M25, A41) 	<p>Do not progress Option 2.</p>

- The M25 provides a natural boundary to the south
- There are better transport links to schools.
- The location would have less impact on the character of the village.
- There are no physical constraints to the south and west: the site could facilitate more development.
- Development would help achieve a greater balance in the density of houses across the village.

Those opposing the option gave the following reasons:

- It is a large, highly visible site in the Green Belt with no defensible boundary. Development would lead to a massive, unsustainable increase in the size of the village.
- Development would threaten Infill of the village to the A41.
- Working farms should be retained for local food production. They are an asset to the village character and part of our heritage needed for future generations. The status of tenants on the site is irrelevant: the farms can be re-let.
- Wayside Farm is a thriving farm and attracted many visitors when it had a public open day in 2008.
- This is a valuable green space used for recreation and education.
- Development would have an impact on wildlife and natural habitats. Local biodiversity should be protected.
- Ownership of the site should not come into the decision making process.
- Access would be from the already congested Watford Road increasing congestion and affecting traffic flows.

Comments from Key Organisations:

- Kings Langley Parish Council:

Wayside Farm is an area of natural habitat and beauty, a working farm in the Green Belt, that offers much to the character and make up of Kings Langley village. All development in this parcel of land should be resisted

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:

- Development would cause significant encroachment in to the countryside.

Hertfordshire Gardens Trust:

- Development would encroach onto an important medieval royal park.

Herts Biological Records Centre:

- It objects to the loss of one of the County's last surviving dairy farms.

HCC (Hertfordshire Property):

- The scale of housing growth is dependent upon the delivery of primary school education. Growth options should not be progressed unless consideration of the planning of the whole settlement confirms that there is capacity within primary schools to support that growth.
- If this can be satisfied, the County Council prefer Option 2. It is closer to the station, is less liable to flooding, has no impact on the setting of GUC and has greater capacity to accommodate the required housing and open space.

Environment Agency:

- Option 2 is preferred because it places development away from the river corridor. There would be less pressure on the water environment compared to Option 1.

QUESTION 5

Should a key emphasis of the spatial strategy be to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment?

52 responses received

Yes - 50 responses

No - 2 responses

Response**Actions**

Nearly all respondents agreed with this approach, with the following points being made:

- Preserving the village character is very important, although this should not be at the expense of more development.
- New development can achieve excellent design, with new buildings emulating and enhancing the architectural character of the village.
- Historic buildings should be protected: some are currently well maintained (e.g. The Priory, the Parish Church).

Three Rivers District Council supports the emphasis on conserving the natural, historic and built heritage.

Those who did not agree said the strategy should include protection of Green Belt boundaries to prevent Kings Langley merging with surrounding towns.

Take approach forward.

QUESTION 6

Do you agree that new housing developments should provide a significant level of affordable housing?

52 responses received

Yes - 31 responses

No - 21 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents agreed for the following reasons:

- There is too much expensive development.
- Affordable housing is crucial to ensure community cohesion and prevent negative relations between socio-economic groups.
- It should provide for couples and young families so they do not have to move from the village and can continue to look after elderly relatives still living in the area.
- More young people are needed to keep the community active.
- This is a Government requirement anyway.

Some provisos were made:

- The housing should be well maintained.
- It should be in keeping with the current village size and scale.
- The term, affordable housing, should be defined and linked to key workers: for example, Kings Langley Primary School teachers struggle to find affordable accommodation in the nearby area.
- More facilities are still needed to support these houses.

Take approach forward.

Those who did not support this approach gave the following reasons:

- A balance between all types of dwellings should be maintained not just one type. A reasonable amount of affordable housing should be provided to meet the natural village population growth.
- Affordable housing should not be the main focus for development, because this would not encourage a diverse mix of people.
- Affordable housing is commonly associated with high density, low quality development (demonstrated by the Ovaltine site). This would not be in keeping with the natural and historic aspects of the village. It would bring the tone of the area down as a result of an increase in crime and litter, and low maintenance.
- There is insufficient employment in the area to attract more workers. Housing should be located in areas with higher employment opportunities. This would avoid commuters (from Kings Langley) increasing traffic and congestion.
- There are thousands of empty properties. Tax incentives should be given to developing these to accommodate affordable houses.
- Only the 35% level indicated in the East of England Plan should be supported.

QUESTION 7a

Should Sunderlands Yard be retained as a local employment site?

51 responses received

Yes - 20 responses

No - 31 responses

Response	Actions
<p>There was mixed response to this. A number supported the retention of Sunderlands Yard because it provides local employment to support residents and the growing population and a balance of activities is necessary for a healthy community. Some provisos and issues were however raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and pollution should not have an impact on surrounding residents. • It should be redeveloped as an attractive commercial area with more office use. • It should be retained only if it is still viable and the employment need still exists. • It can be difficult for big Lorries to access the site. <p>Those who did not support the retention of the employment site gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a brownfield sites in a residential area and should be developed for housing (the allotments should be preserved). • The demand for business in this location has gone. • There are other business sites close by and there are good links from Kings Langley to Hemel Hempstead and Watford, so most people work outside the village. • Access is poor for larger vehicles and noise from the haulage contractor impacts on the amenity of surrounding residents. 	<p>Retain Sunderlands Yard as an employment site, unless a suitable alternative can be found to relocate the employment uses.</p>

QUESTION 7b

Should Sunderlands Yard be retained for residential development?

48 responses received.

Yes - 33 responses

No - 15 responses

Response

Actions

Dependent on the type of development proposed, this received much support:

- It is a brownfield site next to a central residential area. Development would reduce the pressure to build on the Green Belt and can be used to meet affordable housing needs.
- It would improve the area. The current use causes noise and traffic problems for existing residents.
- The employment uses could be moved to one of the other employment sites in the area.

Some provisos were raised:

- Development should only be on half of the site, the rest of the land should be reserved for open space and community facilities
- The allotments should be retained: this is a valuable amenity.
- There should be no greater traffic implications (on Church Lane).

Those who did not support this designation gave the following reason:

- Local employment opportunities need to be kept. However could offices be considered instead of

Retain Sunderlands Yard as an employment site, unless a suitable alternative can be found to relocate the employment uses.

industry?

- New housing would lead to congestion along Church Lane.

However, it was considered that, if houses are considered absolutely necessary in Kings Langley, it would be preferable to use this brownfield site rather than build on the Green Belt.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Kings Langley Parish Council:

- Residential development should be actively encouraged to ease the pressure for expansion into the Green Belt.

Three Rivers District Council:

- Three Rivers Core Strategy has identified employment land within Kings Langley as an area for housing growth through mixed use development. Employment uses should therefore be retained in this part of Kings Langley even if Sunderlands Yard is converted to housing.

QUESTION 8

When future housing development comes forward, we may have to choose between the delivery of affordable housing, towpath improvements, additional outdoor leisure space, or sustainable buildings. Do you think we should prioritise between these objectives?

49 responses received

Yes - 20 responses

No - 18 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents thought the Council should prioritise between these objectives. Their preferences are shown below:

Note importance of affordable housing and outdoor leisure space.

<i>Objective</i>	<i>No. of respondents in order of priority</i>			
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
Affordable housing	14	7	8	8
Towpath Improvements	2	12	9	11
Additional outdoor leisure space	14	9	7	3
Sustainable Buildings	7	7	10	11

Additional outdoor leisure space and affordable housing received the highest priority. Sustainable buildings received the lowest priority, although a number of respondents were unsure what this meant.

Additional outdoor leisure space and affordable housing received the highest priority. Sustainable buildings received the lowest priority, although a number of respondents were unsure what this meant.

It was also felt that other things should be prioritised, including community facilities, road improvements and improvements to parking areas along the High Street (to encourage people to stop and use the village facilities).

Those who said 'No' gave the following reasons:

- There should be no immutable priorities: a sensible balance between them should be reached.
- Should improve what we already have first.
- Sensible planning should be able to realise reasonable improvements to all of the objectives and encourage community partnership working: for example, the secondary school could provide new outdoor leisure space which is available to all and the parish council could take a lead on self-help improvements to the towpath.

Many stated that the maintenance of the towpath was the responsibility of British Waterways, not the Council.

QUESTION 9

The spatial strategy for Kings Langley to 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall do you agree with the strategy?

41 responses received.

Yes - 38 responses

No - 13 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents agreed with the strategy although some provisos were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should not be proposed at the maximum level suggested. • Development should be in keeping with the village profile. • It should take the road layout into account. The village was not built for the car, so there are many parking problems with cars parked on pavements causing problems for pedestrians. Will sustainable buildings include garages? <p>Those who did not agree with the strategy gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy is not clearly defined enough. • Kings Langley is a village and sprawl outwards. • Green Belt development should be avoided to prevent coalescence with nearby towns and to protect the existing character of the village. • Farmland and open land should be protected for food production and quality of life. • Too much focus is being put on affordable housing. Development should be sympathetic to the existing village and villagers. • Improvements should be made to infrastructure and local services before new development takes place. • The level of development needed has not been tested – Green Belt release is necessary to support the demand for housing in the area. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>Three Rivers District Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The theme of Looking after the Environment: Heritage, Biodiversity and Landscape Character should specifically consider the role of green infrastructure in linking biodiversity, landscape 	<p>Take strategy forward.</p>

<p>character and open space in and around the borough. Green infrastructure should be planned, delivered and managed in a coordinated and consistent manner.</p> <p>HCC (Hertfordshire Property) support the overall spatial strategy subject to the proviso that the settlement is planned holistically, considers growth in both Dacorum and Three Rivers and takes the impacts of development on services, particularly primary schools, into account.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 10

Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Kings Langley?	
<p>52 responses received.</p> <p>Yes - 41 responses</p> <p>No - 11 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>A number of other concerns or comments were raised:</p> <p><i>Concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was significant concern about the Three Rivers Core Strategy and approach, which seem to have a greater detrimental impact. The same attitudes and values expressed by Dacorum do not seem to be adopted in Three Rivers. Residents feel they have less control over what happens there, and therefore a joint strategy should be published. • Increased development will lead to increased out commuting with no jobs available in Kings Langley. • Maintaining local agriculture is important as the UK needs to rely less on imported foods. • Where will extra primary schools places be found? • Retaining the village boundaries is crucial for the identity of Kings Langley and avoiding its coalescence with Watford or Hemel Hempstead and retaining its own identity. 	<p>Maintain liaison with HCC to bottom out schooling requirements to 2031.</p> <p>Pick up issues on the environment, community and housing infrastructure in the general strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Comments:

- The strategy is entitled “*Town of Kings Langley*”, not *village*: is there a hidden agenda?
- New development should be carefully controlled to maintain the existing character of the village.
- No consideration has been given to making Tooveys Mill bridge accessible for pushchairs and wheelchairs.
- Consideration should be given to extending the nature reserve and open space for children.
- Road and infrastructure issues need resolving out first.
- More detail is needed in how this will be achieved before asking for people’s opinions.
- Could the Borough boundary be moved so that all of Kings Langley falls within the same borough?
- The strategy should focus more on previously developed sites. The contingency approach, that says that, if Kings Langley does not identify 110-150 dwellings, Green Belt will be released, is not supported.
- The strategy omits the contribution the Rudolf Steiner School makes in the community e.g. schooling, leisure facilities and allotment space.

Alternative site suggestion:

The Head of Kings Langley Secondary School and School Governors suggest that the school site has the potential to support future demands for affordable housing and leisure facilities. This is a community school and should be used by all sectors of the community, not just young people. They hope it will become a hub for the community for childcare, adult learning and leisure facilities. The site has several areas of unused land which could be used to provide affordable houses for key workers.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Kings Langley Parish Council;

- The Council is concerned by what may happen at Shendish and the impact development there will have on the local

services and infrastructure of the village. It is opposed to any major development in the Green Belt here.

HCC Highways:

- Developer contributions from housing development within the village may not be sufficient to make significant improvements to the bus service. Improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes are therefore required to improve links to the High Street and the station.

The Highways Agency:

- It wants to see a reduction in car dependency and impacts on key junctions, such as Junction 20 of the M25, minimised. The additional housing allocated to the village is reasonable, although there is some concern that residents may travel farther afield to jobs, shops and other facilities: improved local connections by public transport would reduce any impact on the road network.

The Council's Parks and Open Space Officer:

- There is a lot of pressure on the publicly accessible open space within the village centre to accommodate community needs. Any additional facilities would require new leisure space.

Hertfordshire Police Authority: does not object to development. However it wishes to ensure that financial contributions are obtained to help support the Police Service and that developments are designed to be secure.

MARKYATE

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the vision for Markyate?

42 responses received

Yes - 34 responses

No - 8 responses

Response

Although most respondents supported the vision the following provisos were made:

- Passenger transport operators may not be willing to increase services if they are not profitable.
- Reference should be made to Hicks Road, given the number of objectives it is likely to meet.
- A contradiction exists between 'providing more local shops and services' and 'improving passenger transport links'. If passenger transport improvements are made, then this will only encourage people to travel to other urban centres, continuing the decline of Markyate.
- Need to make sure that the village maintains its character.
- Local shops are struggling to remain open.
- Local employment opportunities are poor.
- Health care needs to be improved to reduce difficult journeys to Watford and/or Luton.
- HCC Highways would like to see mention of pedestrian / cycle links.

Those who did not agree with the vision suggested the following points should be different:

Actions

Take vision forward.
Remove references to increasing the number and range of shops, tackling congestion in the High Street, links to Luton and Dunstable and employment opportunities.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional housing should be provided to meet natural growth. This should be met by Green Belt release to the south east of the village • Bus services should be improved <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to local schools in Harpenden and St. Albans 2. to Hemel Hempstead and Watford. • The vision should limit new development to sites within the existing settlement to ensure the plan is sound and in accordance with central and regional planning policy. • Markyate should not experience any growth beyond that outlined in the strategy because the village is not adequately served by passenger transport. Future development should be restricted to inside the settlement boundary. <p>One comment said that the aspirations are too vague and will be difficult to deliver in practice.</p>	
--	--

QUESTION 2

Are there any additional key issues we should be considering?	
<p>36 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 26 responses</p> <p>No - 11 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>Additional issues that people wanted to be covered were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Finding a successful development solution for the regeneration of the Hicks Road site' is a 'key issue'. • Providing more open space. • Improving the services offered at the surgery. • 'Leakage' of expenditure out of the village can be tackled by significantly increasing the number of 	<p>Assess infrastructure issues further.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation and Delivery Plan will provide an audit of any</p>

<p>homes around the village (in the Green Belt). This will mean more shops and services can be provided within Markyate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving passenger transport links, and other sustainable modes of travel, to and from Luton, Harpenden and St. Albans' rail stations and schools. • Schools and traffic. • The impact of the Luton Airport. • The need to re-establish/enhance the course of the River Ver. 	<p>infrastructure required.</p> <p>Liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough.</p> <p>Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs and Facilities.</p> <p>Take forward retail and employment issues under Strengthening Economic Prosperity, Creating Jobs and Full Employment and Supporting Retailing and Commerce.</p> <p>Pick up environmental issues under the section Looking After the Environment.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Study will be delivered to help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p> <p>Note link between development and flight paths.</p>
---	---

QUESTION 3

Do you support the principle of Hicks Road coming forward for re-development to accommodate the majority of the village's future needs?

39 responses received

Yes - 34 responses

No - 5 responses

Response

Actions

Those that said 'Yes' gave the following comments:

- The redevelopment of the site provides a once in a life time opportunity to enhance one of the key entrances to the village. Simply redeveloping the site for housing would be a waste. The priority should be on creating a welcoming and attractive village centre. Facilities such as improved healthcare, open space, perhaps a plaza and a small public garden, public conveniences. Some industrial uses should remain on the site.
- Future development policy should not be overly prescriptive and have flexibility to adapt to changing conditions and priorities.
- Ensure a surgery is included in the development.
- Provision must be made for employment.

Some that said 'Yes' also gave the following provisos:

- Redevelopment must not kill off local industry which is established and looking to grow.
- Sewerage capacity and flooding are of concern.
- The impact on road network is also a concern.

Those that answered 'No' made the following points:

- The disruption may force businesses away.

Consider identifying Hicks Road as a Strategic Site.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The village (infrastructure/services) cannot support more development. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>Environment Agency:</p> <p>A flood risk assessment would be required. New development adjacent to the canal should be set back from the deculverted river.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 4a

Do you prefer development Option 1 (redevelopment of Hicks Road site only)?	
<p>29 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 19 responses</p> <p>No - 10 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>Those that answered 'Yes' made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development here would be better integrated into the existing village. This option is likely to be the most practical and deliverable option because Option 2 would require a third party coming forward with land on the edge of the village. Option 1 would still be able to deliver a variety of different uses. New shops might threaten existing shops on the High Street. There should be an incentive for existing shops to relocate. <p>Some who answered 'Yes' gave provisos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements are needed to the A5 junction, to sewerage/drainage and green space in the village. There is concern that employers would face rent 	<p>Take this option forward but consider delivering around 80 homes.</p>

<p>increases in new premises and may not be able to afford to remain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More parking needs to be provided. <p>Those that answered 'No' made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The redevelopment of Hicks Road solely for housing would be a lost opportunity. There should be more imaginative use of the site to create an attractive village centre. • Site should be used primarily for car parking, surgery and other public necessities. • Development of this scale will dramatically increase congestion in the village. • The site is poorly located in relation to public transport, its proximity to the A5 and surrounding congested area and it is located with Flood Zone 3a. • Loss of employment in the village will hinder its ability as a self-sustaining settlement and will not accord with the principles of PPS1. • The loss of employment land in the village may restrict its ability to be self sustaining. 	
---	--

QUESTION 4b

Do you prefer development Option 2 (redevelopment of Hicks Road site and relocation of the employment area south of the village)?

32 responses received

Yes - 12 responses

No - 20 responses

Response

Actions

Those that answered 'Yes' made the following points:

- The relocation of employment uses would provide

Reject Option 2.

more opportunity to plan imaginatively for the site and create an attractive village centre with a variety of uses. Development should insist on imaginative design and high quality design. It should provide many of the much need services, facilities and amenities needed in the village (parking, junction improvements, green space, large family homes and elderly accommodation).

- The overall scheme (including the imaginative redevelopment of Hicks Road for high quality mixed use development) is of such significance that the release of Green Belt land to the south would be justified in this exceptional case.

Those that answered 'No', made the following points:

- There are concerns that the new site would be in the Green Belt and would be far from the village centre with employees having to drive to the shops. Furthermore, there are doubts on actually delivering a new employment site because no specific site has been put forward by a landowner.
- There are concerns that large scale redevelopment may lead to severe disruption to businesses on site and their eventual relocation out of the village. Moreover, the relocated employers would face higher rents on a new site, forcing small businesses to collapse. Disruption needs to be minimal and business rates frozen on any new site.
- The Chilterns Conservation Board is concerned with the impact on the AONB that would result in relocating the employment area. The effect on the River Ver (a chalk stream which is a priority habitat in the UK Biodiversity Plan) is unclear.
- This in an unsustainable location and development of this scale will place undue pressures on the village's existing infrastructure, especially flooding and school capacity.
- There would be too much impact on surrounding properties.
- The Council have already identified the Green Belt site to the south of the village as 'not a particularly sustainable location'.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society believes the redevelopment of land at Hicks Road offers the opportunity

to make a significant opportunity to the village. A mixed use development is supported, perhaps with housing, open space, parking and a health centre. The relocation of the employment area to the south east of the village (in the Green Belt) is supported because this is an exceptional case, and would overall benefit the village.

QUESTION 5

Should a key emphasis of the spatial strategy be to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment of Markyate?

40 responses received

Yes - 39 responses

No - 2 responses

Response

Actions

Those that answered 'Yes' made the following points:

- Any new development should be sympathetic to the historic character of the village.
- Avoid future infilling in the village and protect the character of the High Street.
- Any new housing therefore should be limited and contained within the urban settlement in accordance with PPS1.

Those that answered 'No' made the following point:

- It is important to protect the village but it should not restrict the vitality of the village. There needs to be a balance between protection and allowing development.

Take forward approach.

QUESTION 6

Do you agree that affordable housing should be provided with future housing developments?

34 responses received

Yes - 28 responses

No - 6 responses

Response	Actions
<p>Those that answered 'Yes' made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets should be applied flexibly taking into account the viability of individual schemes. • Releasing Green Belt land would enable more affordable housing to be delivered. • The village needs more large family houses. • Low cost housing should be well mixed with larger housing to avoid 'ghettos' and maintaining a good social mix. <p>Those, who did not agree, thought affordable housing should be provided with some development, but only if it is appropriate to the character of the development.</p>	<p>Take forward the principle to provide affordable housing with future housing developments.</p>

QUESTION 7

Do you think additional provisions such as open space and other services/facilities should be sought for the village with new housing development?

37 responses received

Yes - 35 responses

No - 2 responses

Response**Actions**

Some of those who agreed gave provisos:

- Policy standards should be applied loosely and provision should be in keeping with the scale of the development proposed. Priority should be on improving access to existing open space.
- The current strategy is heavily centred on the redevelopment of Hicks Road. There are doubts that the strategy will actually be able to deliver the open space required. It is recommended that some Green Belt release is put forward to enable the open space deficit to be addressed.
- Children's play areas are needed.
- Traffic and transport problems need to be sorted out first.
- Improved footpath links are required between facilities and through the centre to connect with the countryside network.

Additional Open Space should be sought for the village through the Site Allocations DPD.

QUESTION 8

Do you support our approach to tackling the challenges faced in the village?

31 responses received

Yes - 27 responses

No - 4 responses

Response

Actions

Those that answered 'Yes' made the following points:

- Hicks Road offers the potential to tackle many of the issues facing the village.
- Improving the range of services in the village may reduce the need to travel. There should also be improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes.

Some that said 'Yes' gave provisos:

- The relaxation of certain planning restrictions in the village centre is not supported.
- More needs to be done to support local businesses above and beyond the traditional planning remit.
- A flexible policy approach should be taken towards the redevelopment of Hicks Road. The Council should encourage a range of uses, including higher value uses that will encourage investment.

Take forward approach to tackling challenges.

QUESTION 9**Are there any other ways of improving the economic prosperity of Markyate?**

25 responses received.

Yes - 16 responses

No - 9 responses

Response**Actions**

Those that answered 'Yes' made the following points:

- Hicks Road offers the potential to secure the economic prosperity of the village.
- Small services should be attracted into the village and transport improved to local employment hubs.
- Existing shops need to be rejuvenated.
- A hotel should be included within the Hicks Road site to attract more visitors and in turn attract new investment into the local economy.
- On the other hand, there was an objection to proposals to redevelop Hicks Road and decanting employment uses to a new site. There is a lack of technical work supporting this approach and there is no guarantee that employers will relocate here.

Take forward existing strategy for economic development.

QUESTION 10

Do you support our approach to improving the parking and congestion issue in Markyate?

31 responses received

Yes - 25 responses

No - 6 responses

Response**Actions**

Some said 'Yes' and gave the following provisos:

- Free, designated public parking
- Should be provided either end of the High Street.
- The provision of additional services would reduce trips outside the village and create less congestion on the roads.
- There is a need to improve passenger transport to schools in Luton, Dunstable and Harpenden. However, it was felt that improving passenger transport may lead to further decline in the local shops as people would find it easier to travel to larger urban areas. Our focus should be on improving links to railway stations serving London.

Consider the provision of additional parking through the redevelopment of Hicks Road Strategic Site.

Those that said 'No' gave the following reasons:

- Providing additional parking will only encourage people to drive rather than walk. If parking is provided then it should be for residents of the High Street so their cars can be taken off the road.
- A one way system needs to be implemented along the High Street.

QUESTION 11

The spatial strategy for Markyate to 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall, do you support the strategy?

33 responses received

Yes - 28 responses

No - 6 responses

Response	Actions
<p>Some that said 'Yes' commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local health services should be improved because of the difficulties that rural communities face in accessing health care. • There should be no further building on gardens or on car parking spaces. <p>Those who did not support the strategy gave the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of growth suggested is contrary to central and regional policy and should relate to encouraging limited development within the existing urban boundaries. This will ensure the plan is sound – meeting national policy and preventing sporadic, unsustainable development in the countryside. 	<p>Take strategy forward.</p>

QUESTION 12

Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Markyate?

18 responses received.

No. of Respondents

Yes - 9 responses

No - 9 responses

Response

Actions

Additional comments were:

- The character of the village should be protected and overdevelopment avoided.
- Existing businesses must be protected to enable them to provide jobs for local people. Of the 9 business directly affected by redevelopment 6 expect to expand in the next 5 years. All are leasehold or rented premises and 5 have been trading for more than 15 years.
- The village is very isolated and lacks a number of key services such as schools, hospitals and sports facilities.
- The framework should continue to support the redevelopment and regeneration of the village to avoid stagnation. The council should therefore continue to work with local landowners and developer to bring forward the wider vision.
- The strategy should recognise the proximity of the Chilterns AONB.
- The additional housing allocated to the village is reasonable, although there is some concern that residents may travel farther afield to jobs, shops and other facilities: improved local connections by public transport would reduce any impact on the road network

Pick up issues on the environment, employment, community infrastructure and housing in the general strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Maintain liaison with HCC to bottom out schooling requirements to 2031.

Consider identifying Hicks Road as a Strategic Site.

(Highways Agency).

- Hertfordshire Police Authority it wishes to ensure that financial contributions are obtained to help support the Police Service and that developments are designed to be secure.

TRING

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with the vision for Tring?

195 responses received

Yes - 140 responses

No - 55 responses

Response

The majority of respondents agreed with the vision for Tring with the following provisos or issues raised:

- More emphasis should be placed on Tring as a transition town to encourage sustainability. It should be looking to become carbon neutral.
- There are already plenty of social facilities for the elderly and outdoor leisure space.
- Tourism and leisure uses need to be enhanced.
- The vision does not make reference to a better and more appropriate road network for the area.
- The status of the town, relative to its hinterland, should be clarified. Tring should be a focal point to meet the development needs of this part of the Borough.
- The vision will only be achieved if development along the Green Gateway [Dunsley Farm] is avoided, the character of the settlement is protected and farms retained.
- The policy should incorporate the Natural History Museum's ongoing development plans.

Others, who did not agree with the vision, suggested the following points should be different:

- Tring should remain as it is. There is already a

Actions

Take vision forward.
Include an aim to retain and enhance the built and natural heritage.

sufficient range of houses and businesses for local need.

- More houses will not improve the town's vitality and will conflict with the desire to retain its character.
- Quality of life is not an issue: most Tring residents already have a good quality of life which will be lessened if the proposed development takes place.
- The current infrastructure should be maintained and repaired to a high standard. The vision should not be to develop new facilities.
- The vision should be more specific in regard to transport. A better bus service is needed to serve the station.
- Infrastructure and amenities need to be in place before new dwellings are permitted.
- The need for a greater range of high quality houses seems to be driven by central government not measured by local need or desire.
- It is important to protect biodiversity resources in and around the town and the farms which in turn influence the management of important wildlife sites and SSSIs.
- The vision must address all aspects of the community including jobs, quality of schools and available space, together with sports and leisure facilities and retail.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Tring Town Council disagrees with the vision because it objects to houses being built in the Green Belt. In addition there is no reference to the 3 major employers in Tring – Grass Roots, Tring School and Tesco.

HCC Highways would like to see reference made to accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Chilterns Conservation Board says that insufficient recognition has been given to the position of the AONB around the town.

QUESTION 2

Do you agree with this level of growth?

206 responses received

Yes - 50 responses

No - 156 responses

Response

Actions

The majority of respondents did not agree with the level of growth. Most thought this level was too high, including Tring Town Council and CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society, for the following reasons:

- There are enough houses in Tring. Population is not growing at the predicated rate. Existing properties should be used more effectively.
- Evidence of the need for more than the 310 dwellings proposed within the existing urban area should be shown. If assumptions are incorrect this could lead to population growth not stability.
- There are different forecasts for predicting growth in the number of dwellings. Hertfordshire Country Council's calculation of 87 additional dwellings is preferred because there would be less greenfield land used
- The level of growth is too great for a small town. If is to retain its existing size and character new housing growth should be retained within the existing boundary.
- Have the figures taken the recession into account?
- Development should not take place in the Green Belt, or the Chilterns AONB.
- Greenfield sites should be retained for food and energy provision.
- Current infrastructure cannot support this growth; traffic is a problem and there are already parking problems.
- The level of development will overstretch Tring School.

Take forward two growth level options for further consideration.

- Why will 310 dwellings not meet affordable housing needs or yield new community facilities such as open space?
- Tring Park is Tring's best leisure/amenity space. Taking account of it, the Council's open space study states that there is an excess of 84 ha. So, where does the 9 ha leisure space come from?
- Representations received on behalf of Tring Community Sports Trust (TCST) consider the figure of 9ha misleading – reference should be made to research undertaken by the TCST.

A few respondents however thought this level of growth was too low for the following reasons:

- Tring needs to grow naturally to achieve its vision which will require a higher level of new housing. The figure of 939 (up to 1000) dwellings is needed to meet natural growth in a more sustainable way to also make provision for rural needs.
- 150 dwellings on greenfield sites should be the minimum. To accord with Policy H1 of the East of England Plan the core strategy should allow greater provision in appropriate circumstances.

Those who did agree with the level of growth gave the following provisos:

- Development should not take place on Green Belt land.
- Houses should blend in with existing ones and new infrastructure should be provided to support further development
- Development should be directed along Station Road.
- The proposed level should be achieved and not exceeded.
- Growth should not lead to any detrimental impacts on the AONB or its setting (Chilterns Conservation Board).

QUESTION 3

Are there any additional big issues we should be considering?

170 responses received

Yes - 143 responses

No - 27 responses

Response

Actions

General

- Smaller, more segregated developments could be sympathetically integrated into the town's existing character.
- Building underground would lessen any impact.
- The East of England Plan states Green Belt land should be maintained.
- The Council should consider other development location options (in addition to Options 1 and 2 in Questions 4a and 4b):
 - (a) Development of land north of Station Road could create a sustainable pattern of development that is accessible to the station. It would have less impact on the town, being capable of creating a discrete development of 150 dwellings with some open space.
 - (b) Utilising the site of Tring School site could result in a new school covering a smaller area.
 - (c) Land bordered by B4635 Aylesbury Road, A41 and Duckmore Lane.
 - (d) A well planned town extension to tidy up the Gannel Farm/New Mill area would be far preferable to either Options 1 or 2, with the least visual intrusion into the surrounding landscape.
 - (e) Tring household waste site.
 - (f) The area beyond and bordering Duckmore Lane opposite the top of Longfield Road (resiting the allotments on Option 1 land).
 - (g) Land bounded by Bulbourne Road, Grove Road, Netherby Close is near to the town centre and

Progress other work.
 A range of sites is being identified in the Site Allocations DPD.
 Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs & Facilities.
 The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation and Delivery Plan will provide an audit of any infrastructure required.

<p>station.</p> <p>(h) Land to the north of Icknield Way – referred to as Waterside Way - could include leisure facilities, open space, a marina with moorings, and housing. Development could help improve transport links.</p> <p>(i) John’s Field, Saxon Gate (between Icknield Way and the A41) provides a natural barrier to the town and has excellent communication links. Development would provide an opportunity to create a Park and Ride to remove cars and traffic from the town centre, as well as other needed facilities.</p> <p>A number of specific issues was also raised:</p> <p><i>(a) Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure on local services • Improve school capacity. • Provide a local hospital and proper day care centre for older people. • Improve road surfacing on the High Street. • Traffic and transport improvements needed: improve links to the station, provide noise protection from the A41, reduce pollution, and control commuter ‘rat running’. • Parking improvements: provide off road parking for new developments. • Improve the quality of tourism and leisure facilities. • Lack of sports facilities - identified by the Tring Sports Forum Survey of 2006. • Miswell Lane site for Council Sports Pitch. <p><i>(b) Environment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development should be, as far as possible, zero carbon. • Impact on wildlife sites. • Tring needs to become self sufficient. Hence land is needed to produce more food. Avoid loss of prime Green Belt, farmland and the farming community. 	<p>Pick up environmental issues under the section Looking After the Environment.</p> <p>The Council will liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Study will help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding • Affect on the AONB - important views are not properly recognised. • Preserve the conservation area and historic buildings. • Potential areas for the provision of sustainable energy sources for the town. • Preserve the historic landscape. <p><i>(c) Affordable Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of affordable housing. • Local people should have priority for the occupation of affordable houses. 	
---	--

QUESTION 4a

Do you prefer Option 1 (on land to the west)?

208 responses received

Yes - 78 responses

No - 130 responses

Response

Support for Option 1 is a matter of preference over Option 2. Option 1 is a smaller site with more clearly defined boundaries. Other reasons included:

- the site is close to amenities, main transport routes and next to an employment area;
- it will achieve the minimum level of development with minimal impact upon the character and appearance of the town;
- it is available for development, unaffected by ownership or legal constraints;
- it is a natural extension of the town;

Actions

Take Option 1 forward.

- new open space and cemetery space will be welcomed

Some provisos were made:

- It should only provide the extra 87 dwellings estimated by the County Council.
- The land adjoining should be made available to meet leisure space needs to serve a part of town where this provision is needed (as opposed to providing this provision in the site covered by Option 2).
- The road link to the station would need to be upgraded to accommodate additional traffic.
- The cemetery (designed by Huckvale for N Rothschild) should be screened/ protected from any development.

Reasons for not wanting this option are listed below (they include comments from Tring Town Council, the Chilterns Countryside Group, CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society and the Chilterns Conservation Board):

- No development should take place outside of Tring town boundary. Development has not been proved necessary. Fields are needed to grow food.
- Development would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt.
- Development on Green Belt land goes against the East of England Plan.
- Development will change the character of the town.
- It will push the settlement closer to the ribbon development on Tring Hill reducing the buffer zone and linking Tring with Aston Clinton – the green gateway should be protected.
- The site is too prominent: development will reduce the visual amenity of the western gateway.
- Development would affect the setting of the Chilterns AONB. Pulling development away from the AONB boundary would make the developable area very small, such that it would serve no real purpose.
- The site is not well served by public transport (hence it is not appropriate for the elderly or people with children). It is remote from the station (being beyond the recognised 2km walking distance), and has a poor

<p>relationship to the town centre, shops and services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will place a burden on local services and schools. • The site is too small only meeting the minimum development requirement. There is no opportunity to create leisure space. There is also the temptation to break the Green Belt boundary in the future as more development space is needed. • The site is too big for the number of houses needed – the site has a capacity in excess of 150 dwellings. • The site is more suitable for employment development, a logical extension to the industrial estate. • There will be traffic and noise impacts in an already heavily populated part of Tring. • It is already a valued area of open space for leisure use. • The proposal goes against the expressed wishes of the Tring Place Workshop. • It was discounted within the SHLAA. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <p>Aylesbury Vale District Council expressed concern that the site is very close to the district boundary and could have landscape, transport, countryside and visual impacts.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 4b

Do you prefer Option 2 (on land to the east, Dunsley Farm)?

354 responses received

Yes - 17 responses

No - 337 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The objections are based on the following reasons (they include comments from Tring Town Council, the Chilterns Countryside Group, CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society, the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust and the Chilterns Conservation Board):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is within the Green Belt and adjacent to the Chilterns AONB, hence development would be contrary to PPG2 and PPS7. There is no case or robust evidence for additional housing within the Green Belt. • It was once part of the AONB and remains an extremely picturesque area. • The frontages to London Road and Cow Lane are very important to the setting of the AONB and should not be affected. A small development area focused on Station Road and appropriately designed would have less impact on the AONB (Chilterns Conservation Board). • The adopted Local Plan states, ‘Tring has developed up to its definable limits and should not be breached otherwise it would put strain on the existing services’. What has changed? • The land contains two successful farms contributing to the town’s economy and should remain at the heart of a town like Tring (a transition town). Land is required to produce food and resources in a time when it is shrinking in the UK. The tenant of Dunsley Farm refers to the loss of his farm and home for the past 41 years. • The site is very much larger than needed for the number of houses proposed (risking the potential to develop 600 new dwellings). • A large development would be adjacent to Pendley Manor and would be detrimental to the parkland and views from it. • There are no well defined boundaries, which could lead to further development or expansion. • This is a sensitive green gateway, currently well used for leisure and recreation, with a number of public footpaths through the site. Views across the AONB and Ridgeway will be compromised, deterring visitors coming to the area. 	<p>Do not pursue Option 2.</p>

- Building would change the character of the town.
- Access roads are narrow and poor, and cycle/footways not available. People would still use their cars to drive to the station even though it is quite close.
- Development would be a burden on the local infrastructure. Tring School is over subscribed. It is a flood plain and the area is prone to flooding.
- Development would contradict the vision for Tring outlined in the strategy. The site currently contains a number of valuable features including the County Wildlife site, sports facilities (tennis, football and cricket pitches), farm shops and archaeology (evidence of ridge and furrow).
- There are more than sufficient open space and leisure facilities: provision of leisure facilities is no justification for allowing development.
- Development should be accommodated within the current town boundary only.
- As an alternative, the Council should consider a spread of housing and leisure developments around different parts of Tring to avoid a large concentration in one location. This will reduce the impact on the character and appearance of the town.
- The proposal goes against the expressed wishes of the Tring Place Workshop.

Those in support of this option gave the following reasons:

- It could achieve the long term aim (provided it is sensitively developed) with the capacity for future expansion.
- It would leave Icknield Way available for further employment development.
- A more appealing, centralised location with better access to services and transport links.
- Sports fields and community facilities for young and the elderly would be an asset.
- If leisure space is to be provided here anyway, it makes sense to provide a comprehensive development.

Other supporters of this option gave the following provisos:

- Development should be confined to the northern part of the site, adjoining existing houses, and be carefully landscaped.
- The school should not be moved to the site (this would place it even further from most residents).
- The County Wildlife site should be retained.
- The present wide green gateway should be kept on both sides of London Road in view of the important characteristic of the town.
- Expansion should be limited to allow some of the existing productive farmland to be retained.
- Cow Lane should be upgraded, with a roundabout at its junction with Station Road.

Comments from Key Organisations:

- Representations made on behalf of Tring Community Sports Trust say that the sports facilities element needs to be greater in scale. Therefore the site should not be considered for residential but for leisure/sports facilities only, together with the relocation of Tring School.
- HCC Highways prefer this option in term of better access to bus stops: it is closer to the station and other services.
- HCC (Hertfordshire Property) prefer Option 2 because it is closer to the town centre, station and other facilities and amenities. It is significantly larger and therefore able to accommodate greater development needs including longer term development needs of the school.

QUESTION 5

Should the key built and environmental assets of Tring be protected and enhanced, as outlined in paragraphs 1.3 to 1.6?

185 responses received

Yes - 180 responses

No - 5 responses

Response

Actions

This received almost 100% support demonstrating the importance of these to the character of the town.

Take forward approach and refer to in the vision.

There was concern over the current quality of some of these assets – in particular Dundale Wildlife Site and pollution levels at Brook Street.

Concern was raised that development and industry would cause further pollution and waste, impacting on the wildlife sites and the natural environment. Developing Option 2 would destroy this part of Tring.

Some respondents suggested other assets/areas should also be protected or enhanced including:

- the Green Belt,
- land to the south of Station Road including Pound Meadow and sports pitches.
- the College Lake Wildlife Centre (in Buckinghamshire),
- the High Street (by supporting small businesses),
- Wildlife Sites,
- Pendley Park,
- Tring Park.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre commented that if key resources are only those described - many of which are already nationally or internationally important - the local biodiversity resources which reflect the town's countryside heritage will be threatened. It would be preferable to provide a general statement about the importance of biodiversity resources, consistent with several other settlement statements.

A market town such as Tring is not capable of accommodating 3 storey high density developments – contrary to statements in the Urban Design Assessment for Tring (Zone 1).

QUESTION 6

Should Akeman Street General Employment Area include a wider range of uses?

157 responses received

Yes - 79 responses

No - 78 responses

Response

Actions

There was a mixed response to this question.

Many who thought the area should include a wider range of uses gave provisos:

- Priority should still be given to suitable employment uses.
- There are current traffic and parking issues which require consideration. We should not increase traffic movement or heavy industrial vehicles.
- It should be done sympathetically – the nature of the development needs to be compatible with the surrounding residential area.

Identify Akeman Street General Employment Area as a place which can include a wider range of non-residential uses.

Those against a wider range of uses gave the following reasons:

- It is an important employment area and should not be used for other uses. It is fundamental to the sustainability and vitality of the town and helps support the vibrancy and economy of the town centre. Should encourage a continued mix of small businesses to develop employment in Tring.
- The area already contains a wide range of uses and is too busy already.
- Range of uses needs to be more fully defined.
- Little evidence that the area is needed for community facilities. Tring Town Council say there is sufficient community use provision already in the town e.g. Red Cross Hall, Victoria Hall, several church halls etc. The refurbishment of Temperance Hill has also enhanced community facilities in the Town.
- Parking and transport problems – the road and access is very narrow. It could not accommodate additional traffic and it would be dangerous for pedestrians using the social facilities. There is not sufficient parking for people who would want to use the community facilities.

Others felt that the existing employment uses should be relocated and the area made available for housing so as to reduce traffic levels. Provision for affordable housing or housing for the elderly was considered particularly appropriate due to the area's accessibility to local services and town centre.

QUESTION 7a

Do you agree that Heygates Tring Mill should be redesignated to employment use?

151 responses received

Yes - 106 responses

No - 45 responses

Response

Actions

Heygates is an important established local industry in the area:

- It provides and encourages employment opportunities for local people
- The redesignation would provide a clear policy position and framework for its future use.
- Access is good.
- It would protect it from being converted into dwellings.

The reasons given for opposing redesignation were as follows:

- We would lose the opportunity to convert the buildings into houses if Heygates ceases in trading – it is a prime location overlooking the canal and could be used to accommodate housing need.
- The site should remain, as it currently is within a designated residential area.
- The employment use might intensify. Development would then have an impact on the adjacent residential area, reservoirs and canal in terms of noise and risk of pollution.
- Road links are not suitable for additional traffic.
- If there is no demand, then it should be used to provide housing.
- Further employment is not needed when Icknield Way General Employment Area is not fully utilized.

Retain existing use. Should it relocate, consider a mix of uses.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should consider designating for mixed use to retain flexibility. 	
--	--

QUESTION 7b

Do you agree that Heygates Tring Mill should be redesignated to mixed use?	
<p>145 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 49 responses</p> <p>No - 96 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>There was less support for this option. A number of respondents have misunderstood what redesignation means. They are concerned it will result in the Mill being forced to move from the site, which would be opposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site should be retained in employment use to provide job opportunities in Tring. redesignation could allow housing which is not needed and may set a precedent for further housing development along the Wendover Arm. Further intensification of the site would create a nuisance for surrounding residents. Access and parking is not suitable to take more traffic. If the Mill ceases to exist it should be all residential because this will have the least impact on the surrounding area and it is already in a designated residential area. <p>There was some support to this redesignation, including from Tring Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be an opportunity to breathe life into this part of Tring. 	<p>Retain existing use. Should it relocate, consider a mix of uses.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be a good location for flats and affordable housing. • There is currently a mix of uses in the area and the size, location and existing use would have minimal impact on nearby residents. • This could be a practical solution to the problem of providing extra houses and employment opportunities without the need to develop in the Green Belt. <p>Some provisos were suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sufficient space should be retained for businesses; • traffic issues should be fully considered; and • the site is not used for heavy industry, with a risk of pollution. <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board comments that removal of large industrial buildings could improve the landscape, while replacement with bland employment buildings and housing would fail to conserve the setting of the AOB.</p>	
--	--

QUESTION 8

Should the market, the auction rooms and the Natural History Museum be protected from redevelopment?

182 responses received

Yes - 180 responses

No - 2 responses

Response

These facilities form an important part of the town centre and character/culture of the town. Much funding has gone into them and they are popular with children and bring visitors into the town from outside.

The market provides economic and environmental benefits

Actions

Take forward the principle to retain and protect the market, the auctions rooms and the Natural History Museum.

providing community spirit and good for town community, although there was concern that it receives less support each week.

Whilst the retention of the market and Natural History Museum was completely supported, some respondents felt that if the auction rooms ceased to be viable they should not be protected. A change of use to provide community use (day centre or elderly persons home) or employment use should then be considered. As there is no requirement for the auction rooms to be located within the town centre, they could be located anywhere as users bring little business to other town traders.

There was a query as to whether reference should have been made to Local History Museum. It is considered both it and the Natural History Museum should be protected from redevelopment.

The Natural History Museum requested that the Council incorporate flexibility into the policy to allow for essential development and changes in accordance with the Museum's role as a tourist attraction and cultural asset.

QUESTION 9

Are there any other ways of improving the economic prosperity of Tring?	
155 responses received	
Yes - 142 responses	
No - 13 responses	
Response	Actions
One respondent did not think the economic prosperity of Tring needed improving. Other respondents made suggestions.	Allow for the extension of Icknield Way Industrial Estate to

<p><i>(a) For business and commerce:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make better use of Icknield Way Business Park by allowing its extension. • Provide more office space to avoid out commuting - particularly encourage and support small scale business start ups / workshops (develop principle of Tring in Transition). • Protect existing employment areas. • Turn one of the industrial estates into a high tech area. • Promote farming and sale of local produce. • Re-use redundant rural buildings for alternative employment use. <p><i>(b) For tourism:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and preserve the town's unique character to encourage visitors and sustain community spirit. • Utilise the canals more, and create a marina on the Wendover Arm and improve the tow-paths. • Improve public and sustainable transport links from the station to encourage people into the centre and tourist attractions including the Natural History Museum, canals and reservoirs (this view is also expressed by British Waterways). • Encourage a wider range of shops, restaurants and pubs to encourage spending in Tring (including through the reduction of rents and pedestrianisation of the High Street). <p><i>(c) By encouraging other uses:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate new housing so that people who live in Tring support its economy. • Provide a greater variety of homes to reflect need, particularly starter homes and homes for the elderly. • Improve community facilities. 	<p>replace any employment space lost elsewhere in the town.</p> <p>In addition allow small-scale extensions or development to increase the amount of retail space in the town centre.</p>
---	---

QUESTION 10

The spatial strategy for Tring to 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall do you support the Strategy?

182 responses received

Yes - 72 responses

No - 110 responses

Response

Actions

Points raised against the Strategy are listed below:

- It does not address the problem of stabilising population growth.
- The strategy is confusing. It should focus on the main aims and how to go about achieving them. There are too many opposing paragraphs.
- Meeting local housing need should more clearly relate to guidance in PPS3. Local housing is not simply affordable housing but comprises a mix of housing tenures, including open market.
- The principles outlined in the strategy will not be achieved if Option 2 is taken forward.

(a) *Environment:*

- It is not possible to protect views and wildlife corridors. The green gateway will be ruined if Option 2 is developed.
- The aims focus too much on change and not on protecting and improving the existing assets of the environment.
- Development of greenfield sites would work against the interest of the town and aims of the transition movement. Further development would exacerbate car usage and increase carbon emissions
- Farmland and the Chilterns AONB should be preserved.

Take strategy forward.

- The strategy gives insufficient emphasis to the setting of the town in the Chilterns AONB.
- The hedgerows of Tring Mansion should not be singled out alone for improvement but also the hedgerows along the London Road and across the fields. That area is as important as any to wildlife and deserves to be protected the same way that Tring Park is protected.

(b) *Social and personal welfare:*

- Development should not be used to provide additional sporting facilities.
- There is not enough information on the improvement of infrastructure.
- Tring School should not be moved – the current site can accommodate expansion.
- We have not been asked if accommodating all sports facilities, as appears to be suggested, would be appropriate (however sports and leisure facilities would be preferable to housing)
- The amalgamation of playing fields at Miswell Lane is not achievable or proven to be deliverable.

(c) *Economic prosperity:*

- Small business parks should be extended.

Supporters raised the following provisos:

- Future development is small scale and does not use Green Belt land.
- Housing need is revised, to really 'Look after the Environment'.
- Views of farming, fields and meadows are retained. These are essential to the nature of the Chilterns AONB and Tring. Roads entering Tring should remain "green".
- Community facilities are retained and existing services remain open (household waste site, police service, full time Council office). The school should remain on its existing site.
- Existing employment and retail units are better utilized.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing target should be revised - it is not sufficient. • The strategy is supported provided only Option 1 is taken forward. 	
--	--

QUESTION 11

Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Tring?

182 responses received

Yes - 117 responses

No - 65 responses

Response

Actions

A number of other concerns or comments were raised:

Concerns:

- Concern that a site for Gypsies and travellers is going to be included in either Option 1 or 2. Will Dunsley Farmhouse be knocked down to accommodate the development?
- No reference is made to the closure of the Household Waste Site. This is a valuable resource and provision for its retention should be included.

Consider concerns further in the general strategy for housing development options, infrastructure provision and securing quality design.

Maintain liaison with Hertfordshire Property and Children, Schools and Families at HCC.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale development on farmland and open space will affect surface water run-off and result in flooding in the town centre. • Concern that the “Inner Zone’ in the Urban Design Assessment is capable of accommodating 3-story development. • Concern that development options will be decided on in terms of how much money can be achieved through developer contributions. <p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recognition of the challenges presented by climate change – provision should be included for local alternative energy generation to the objection of Tring becoming carbon neutral. Policies to implement planning conditions on new housing developments to achieve energy efficiency over and above current building regulation should be in place. The same should be implemented for water conservation and BREEAM standards for non-residential buildings. • Tring School should be retained on its existing site where it is more accessible to all. Moving it will increase traffic. • Insufficient weight has been given to the existence of the two farms in Option 2 and the tenants have not been consulted in this process. • The proposals of the Tring Sports Forum have been given too much weight and need to be reviewed and justified in leisure and economic terms. There is scope to improve the existing facilities rather than add to them. • It is important to improve and promote alternative transport modes, e.g. public transport and cycling routes. • There are a number of factual mistakes in this document - the church has a tower not a spire; the Rothschild Period and Tudor-revival periods are the same; College Lake nature reserve is not a reservoir. • Access to outdoor green space should be looked at more carefully: there are already numerous parcels of open land, National Trust and Woodland Trust land and a large network of bridle paths and footpaths. • An improvement in quality of life does not have to be 	<p>Issues regarding the environment and community infrastructure will be picked up in the general strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.</p>
--	--

dependent on the increase in the population as predicted. The town can still improve without this increase in development. The new museum, delivered without the need for houses, demonstrates that.

- The strategy has a confusing structure in relation to the dwelling number. Why are sites capable of accommodating 380-600 dwellings being referred to as development options when only 150 extra dwellings are proposed?
- It seems more logical to spread the development between the two option sites in terms of ensuring delivery and providing consumer choice.
- A third option to not support either site should have been included in the consultation paper.
- The proposed occupancy of new dwellings should represent the mix within the existing community. There should not be a disproportionately large number being provided for low occupancy.

Comments from Key Organisations:

HCC Highways would like to see measures incorporated to encourage more use of sustainable modes of transport to access the station.

Aylesbury Vale District Council comments on the need to ensure that environmental designations in the two authorities accord with one another – e.g. the Boarscroft Vale area, Wildlife Sites, the Grand Union Canal and Aylesbury Arm.

DBC Parks and Open space would like to see Improved connections to open space within the town and the surrounding countryside and the quality of existing facilities improved.

The Chilterns Conservation Board considers the strategy gives insufficient emphasis to the town's setting – it is surrounded by the AONB.

Hertfordshire Police Authority does not object to development. However it wishes to ensure that financial

contributions are obtained to help support the Police Service and that developments are designed to be secure.	
--	--

COUNTRYSIDE

QUESTION 1

Paragraphs 1.15, 1.16 and 1.42 refer to some despoiled areas in the countryside that require improvements. Are there any other areas you wish to draw to our attention?

41 responses received

Yes - 15 responses

No - 26 responses

Response

Actions

A number of other areas were mentioned:

- Substations within the AONB and 11kV overhead lines should be considered inappropriate development and be replaced with underground cables.
- Aircraft noise over Markyate
- Stagnant, litter filled pools at Fields End, which are a health hazard and should be removed.
- Areas prone to fly tipping and littering have increased since the closure of the recycling centre at Tring.
- The old tip site at New Mill.
- Area adjacent to Little Dickhill Wood and the adjacent barns.
- The bright lights of the golfing range located at the end of Shootersway. They shine into the sky at night to the detriment of the environment.
- Haulier's depot – Land between the A41, Shootersway and Two Ponds Lane.
- Scrap depot along Chesham Road in Wigginton – heavy lorries run through the village to the detriment of the environment and danger to residents.
- The lorry dump on the opposite site of the A41, adjacent to the Wilstone reservoir.

Include a Policy within the Core Strategy with the presumption that all development will help to conserve and enhance Dacorum's natural and historic landscape.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ongoing development at the Cheddington Airfield industrial sites and Marsworth Airfield South site. Lorries from this site block roads and junctions, cause noise and are inappropriate in these locations. • Marsworth camp to the east of Long Marston. • Land between Shendish and Rucklers Lane - has been allowed to revert to a dense area of small saplings. • Bourne End Mills • Badgerdell Wood, Chipperfield. 	
---	--

QUESTION 2

Do you agree with the vision for the countryside?	
<p>49 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 31 responses</p> <p>No - 16 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents agreed with the vision. The following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What criteria should be applied to assess ‘local need’? • Reference to biomass should be removed because land should be used to grow food. • The principle of food security should guide the vision. • Woodland management should specifically mention the enhancement of biodiversity as a key output. <p>Those who disagreed with the vision made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a very limited number of new houses. No development should take place on greenfield sites. Conversions and redevelopment of buildings may provide much of the housing needed. 	<p>Take vision forward.</p> <p>Include a reference to preserve food security and encourage local food production together with a greater emphasis to strengthen the rural economy.</p>

- The countryside should be protected from development at all costs. If any development is necessary, it should be minimal and sympathetic to its surroundings.
- If there is a question of priority between improving streams and ensuring adequate water supplies, we should favour household water supplies.
- Where will funding for improvements come from? The vision should only include things that are realistic, definite and achievable.
- Arriving by public transport or bicycle is not practical: much of the countryside does not have a bus service and most people arrive by car. Industrial and other traffic make conditions less pleasant and safe for cyclists. Along country lanes.
- No mention is made of local businesses, which are fundamental to the economic well being of the countryside. The vision should support existing local businesses.
- We need to protect more than just the best and most distinctive features.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Herts Biological Records Centre:

- supports the vision, stressing the importance of livestock and farming in maintaining the function of the countryside and character of the landscape. A robust countryside needs to have the ability to counteract damaging development or the benign redundancy of undeveloped land. Farming should be encouraged to help deliver local distinctiveness and food security through agri-environment schemes and opportunities to develop new, local markets: this will support local food production, benefitting wildlife and the landscape.

The National Trust:

- supports the inclusion of the countryside vision, polices in the Core Strategy and the mention of the Ashridge Estate and Green Tourism and their cycling strategy. The National Trust would also welcome reference to the role it plays at Ashridge in providing open access land (para 1.25)

Chilterns Society and London Green Belt Council:

- supports the vision for the countryside. The

<p>countryside is vital for our health and for our food. Nothing should be built on greenfield land without indisputable need. There is no such need at present. Land which is built upon is lost forever.</p> <p>Chilterns Conservation Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports the vision and suggests the countryside should be conserved and enhanced (rather than protected and improved). Drought and overabstraction of water may prevent populations of brown trout being viable in the chalk streams. <p>CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • says that reference should be made to the production of timber. Management of woodland for timber need not be incompatible with other countryside objectives – i.e. those related to biodiversity, recreation and landscape. <p>HCC Highways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consider it would be more appropriate to refer to the improvement and promotion of more sustainable means of access. This is may be more readily achieved than making reference to most visitors arriving by public transport or bicycle. <p>The Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports the vision and suggests reference to appropriate management of the countryside. 	
---	--

QUESTION 3

Are there any additional key issues we should be considering?	
<p>50 responses received Yes - 34 responses No - 16 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>A number of issues were raised:</p> <p><i>New development and housing:</i></p>	<p>Assess infrastructure issues further.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider a small village development centred on the Old Chequers public house in Gaddesden Row. • Further consideration needs to be given to places such as Aldbury, which attracts tourists. More visitor car parking is required so people can more easily access local services. • Bourne End has been ignored. Limited infill development should be considered as there is substantial underused land with the village. • There is a need for private houses for local people, as well as affordable housing. This would then reflect advice in PPS3 “...to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home which they can afford in a community where they want to live”. The natural evolution of small villages in the Green Belt has stopped. Families who have lived in these settlements for generations have to move out due to the constrained supply of houses. • Brownfield sites should support future growth. <p><i>Environment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protection of the Green Belt and agricultural land; • maintaining and enhancing biodiversity; • the impact of climate change on food and water security in Dacorum (This covers the preservation of working farms and the Green Belt for future food production and local food marketing.); • structured archaeological and biodiversity audits for the entire rural area (This could inform future planning and green tourism activities.); • encouraging more, renewable energy generation in the countryside; and • the effects of climate change on agriculture (including lowering of the water table). <p><i>Traffic and transport:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the volume and speed of traffic through the countryside; • discouraging car use to places such as Ashridge by providing excellent bus services (powered by green energy); • public transport (there is lack of public transport and 	<p>The Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study and the Implementation and Delivery Plan will provide an audit of any infrastructure required.</p> <p>Liaise with Herts Property and Children, Schools and Families at Herts County Council to bottom out school requirements in the borough.</p> <p>Take forward transport issues under the Sustainable Development Strategy: Enabling Convenient Access Between Homes, Jobs and Facilities.</p> <p>Take forward employment issues under Strengthening Economic Prosperity, Creating Jobs and Full Employment and Supporting Retailing and Commerce.</p> <p>Pick up environmental issues under the section Looking After the Environment.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure Study will be delivered to help evaluate biodiversity resources in the borough and identify biodiversity opportunities.</p> <p>Note link between development and flight paths.</p>
---	--

the exclusion of rural areas from transport plans will lead to deterioration in links to the countryside);

- traffic management policies to restrict the size of vehicles using small rural roads; and
- creating a new gateway to the Chilterns at Tring Station.

Economy:

- encouraging appropriate levels of growth in employment, commercial facilities and housing.

General:

- location of new infrastructure for green tourism (It must harmonise with the environment and preserve existing amenity.);
- retaining community facilities (The SHLAA has identified community facilities in Aldbury, such as the community hall for residential redevelopment. These, plus employment and business sites in the countryside should be protected and given clear support in the Core Strategy.); and
- extending the Green Belt boundary to include Tring Rural Parish Council.

Comments from Key Organisations:

The National Trust highlighted the challenge of accommodating and promoting extra visitor pressures on open access land: i.e.

- to protect land of high nature conservation importance
- to promote interpretation of landscape and other countryside issues
- to respect pressures on rural infrastructure; and
- to promote rural transport.

The Environment Agency would like the following issues added:

- securing contributions toward the ecological improvement of identified water bodies.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using redevelopment to achieve the remediation of contaminated land. • the availability of water, because the South East is identified as an area of water stress. <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust refers to extensive estates with designed landscapes and suggests an additional issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protection and enhancement of historic landscapes. <p>It suggests reference to more sites – Lockers Park School, Woodcock Hill, Shantock Hall and Pendley Manor.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board would like the following issues added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the overabstraction of water and consequences of future development on water supply • adequate provision of green infrastructure. <p>It also comments that the river assessments in the draft Thames River Basin Assessment state the ecological status of the Ver is poor and none of the rivers in the borough will achieve good status by 2021.</p>	
---	--

QUESTION 4a

Do you prefer Option 1 (389 dwellings)?	
<p>43 responses received</p> <p>Yes - 22 responses</p> <p>No - 21 responses</p>	
Response	Actions
<p>Reasons in support include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current policy approach is quite successful and future expansion with small levels of infilling will allow villages to absorb new residents. 	<p>Take forward Option 1.</p>

- This is a more sustainable way of catering for population growth.
- Development will be closer to amenities.
- Growth should be limited to preserve the character of the countryside for future generations.
- Farming should be the priority not housing.
- This would give a limited amount of support for local services (Chilterns Conservation Board).

One proviso was raised: the majority of development should be for affordable housing.

Those who do not prefer Option 1 gave the following reasons:

(a) The level (of housing suggested) is too low:

- It is too small to enable the current level of population to be maintained, exacerbating existing problems of housing supply both private and affordable and will not help to sustain facilities such as bus routes and public houses.
- It is a continuation of current policy which is failing to deliver sufficient additional housing.
- There are insufficient homes in rural areas for people brought up there and to provide a pool of labour for local jobs and businesses in the countryside.

(b) The level is too high:

- Development should be minimal within the villages. Increased development will risk merging of some of these settlements with towns. Services and infrastructure cannot support more development.

One respondent, who did not agree, wanted to know what is affordable in this area and who would buy.

QUESTION 4b

Do you prefer Option 2 (567 dwellings, maintaining the existing population)?

30 responses received

Yes - 18 responses

No - 11 responses

Response

Actions

Reasons in support include:

- Option 2 would best meet local housing, create viable communities, support local services, build affordable houses and raise the quality of life in rural areas.
- Villages need to be sustained in the long run which can only be achieved by more development to stop the closure of any more village facilities and help maintain viable local services.
- There are insufficient homes available for people brought up in rural areas or elderly accommodation for when residents get older.

EERA says that Option 2 relates well to the Council's vision for the borough

A few provisos were raised:

- Development must fit in with the existing architecture.
- The higher level of houses does not address the need for private housing (as well as affordable housing).
- More houses are needed to help sustain facilities such as public houses and the viability of bus routes.
- Infill should also be permitted in areas which are currently outside the village boundary but form natural village extensions.

Reject Option 2.

Those, who did not support Option 2 (including Chipperfield Parish Council), gave the following reasons:

- Farmland around villages should be used for agricultural purposes.
- Rural infrastructure cannot support more development.
- The quality of life for residents should be retained which means limiting the number of new properties proposed to infilling.
- The housing figure is still too low, and more rural housing sites are needed.

QUESTION 5

Should a key emphasis of the spatial strategy be to protect and enhance the built, historic and environmental assets of the countryside?

38 responses received

Yes - 36 responses

No - 2 responses

Response

- Almost 100% of respondents are in support:
- These factors define what the countryside means
 - A good quality working countryside is a vital asset for all.
 - Local identities and character should be respected and preserved.
- However some issues were raised:
- Additional tree planting along the major transport corridors; this is becoming more important because of the increase of traffic. The policy needs to be more pro-active than simply 'promote where we are able'.
 - Conservation of important geological features like the Bulbourne Gutter and pingos (on Boxmoor).

Actions

Take forward through the vision.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the countryside in adapting to climate change: renewable energy schemes should be more easily allowed, e.g. solar panels in conservation areas. • Enhancement should be the priority and farming protected. The growing of bio-fuels should not be large scale monoculture. • Other key objectives should be taken into account involving supporting the rural economy, promoting tranquillity and encouraging appropriate levels of access. Support in projects such as the Chilterns Leader and rural enterprises is important for rural regeneration in an area which faces high land values and development pressures. • There is an opportunity to look at the strategy for each Landscape Conservation Area (within the Landscape Character Assessment). Actions to restore, improve and conserve the landscape would benefit from a proactive approach to larger scale habitat creation and carbon fixing [through tree planting]. <p>Reasons for not supporting this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although historic buildings must be protected, the key emphasis should be on protecting green fields. • This approach does not appear to allow the countryside to develop and prosper, and will result in a decline of the countryside as a place in which to live and work. This will not improve or enhance the economic or social welfare of the countryside. 	
--	--

QUESTION 6

Paragraphs 1.14 – 1.16, 1.32 – 1.39 and 1.42 in the context indicate the extent to which the countryside has been infiltrated by “non-rural” uses. This might suggest further employment uses should be deterred. Do you think there is a need for further local job growth in the countryside and its villages?

36 responses received

Yes - 23 responses

No - 12 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of responded did think there was a need for further local job growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited job growth, particularly in and around villages is needed to replace job losses (e.g. in agriculture) and help sustain communities. • People in these businesses can help sustain local trade and facilities such as shops. • High quality broadband internet access should be made available to allow people to work from home. This has no environmental impact and will reduce traffic on the road. • We should encourage jobs for young people, so they do not have to travel or move out of the area. • Employment is a fundamental part of the countryside and should not be seen as inappropriate. Agrarian and leisure businesses should especially be supported. <p>The following provisos were raised. New employment uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should be very limited, sustainable projects which will not use more Green Belt land or countryside than necessary. • need to be related to land management activities to ensure there is a link between the rural (and urban) communities and to conserve the countryside environment. • Should not intrude into the natural environment or lead to environmental problems such as increased traffic. • reuse existing rural buildings or they meet a local need only <p>Those who did not think there was a need for further local job growth gave the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no further erosion of the countryside – this part of the country is already over developed. • Commercial uses cause traffic, noise and nuisance for adjoining occupiers. Roads are already in a poor state and cannot support more traffic. • Job opportunities are available in urban areas nearby – transport links should be improved to 	<p>Refer to the importance of the rural economy in the vision, the strategic and local objectives, and section on Strengthening Economic Prosperity. Balance with environmental objectives.</p>

<p>access them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk of losing the rural farming character. <p><i>Comments from Key Organisations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC (Hertfordshire Property) agree. Local job growth will allow farm diversification and help reduce travel to town for employment. 	
---	--

QUESTION 7

Have you any other suggestions as to how the economic prosperity of the countryside can be improved and local services supported?

32 responses received

Yes - 19 responses

No - 12 responses

Response

Actions

Suggestions include:

(a) Promotion of rural business:

- Consideration should be given to meeting demand for live/work units in villages. Live/work units could help improve economic prosperity and sustain small communities. They could even be accommodated in the AONB, if design and siting are appropriate.
- High quality internet access allows more people to work at home lowering travel needs and reducing environmental impacts. [Paragraph 1.40 recognises that homeworking is proportionately more significant in the countryside.]
- Increasing support for infrastructure and local employment and business opportunities in the villages and countryside will help businesses to

Pick up in the general strategy under Strengthening Economic Prosperity.

expand and diversify.

- More emphasis should be placed on local food supplies and consumption – with support from local shops and restaurants.
- Support for local food production includes the provision of processing facilities and enterprises.
- Councils should promote central government subsidies for arable and pastoral farming to make this use of land for food production economic.

(b) Improvement of rural transport for the benefit of tourists:

- Improve public transport and maintain footpaths to encourage walkers.
- Parking should be improved in villages to allow more people to visit and shop, and access local services. Cars invariably line the streets causing congestion.
- To lessen the pressure created on the countryside by car borne visitors, the National Trust would welcome a section dealing with the promotion of new technologies to deal with a demand based rural transport system to encourage non-car based visits.
- Replace Tring station to make it a real gateway and transport hub for Tring and the surrounding countryside and villages. This should include cycle racks, improving local links and exploiting the amenity of the canal nearby.

(c) General:

- Village boundaries should be reconsidered to release land for housing and/or economic development to help support existing local facilities.
- Increasing population base will improve economic prosperity and support local services however this needs to be balanced against other considerations.
- Encourage more green tourism, education in woodlands, investment in farming.

The Boxmoor Trust would like some of the Trust's land to be classified as a key biodiversity area. Reference should also

be made to the importance of the Bulbourne Valley, managed by the Trust as well as leisure and sport facilities (para 1.22 – 1.25) and the Trust as a local business (para 1.39)

QUESTION 8

Do you have any other concerns regarding the strategy for the countryside to 2031?

44 responses received

Yes - 26 responses

No - 18 responses

Response

Actions

A number of other concerns and suggestions were raised:

Concerns:

- Bourne End is not referred to in the whole document. It is omitted from paragraph 1.18 which otherwise provides details of the character of all of the settlements in the Borough (including smaller settlements, such as Great Gaddesden and Piccotts End).
- Noise and pollution within the AONB and surrounding area from road and air traffic. The growth of air traffic and high speed rail should be given much higher consideration in the long term strategy for the countryside.
- The vision will not be achieved without the education of local communities to help encourage small businesses development and deliver purchasing choice.

Suggestions:

- The AONB boundary needs reviewing, particularly around Bourne End.

Pick up issues on the environment, employment, community infrastructure and housing in the general strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

- The Bourne Gutter valley landscape should be included within the AONB. It supports an impressive series of rolling dry valleys and includes a historically important winterbourne which is currently being considered for RIGS status.
- Protection of land between Berkhamsted and Hemel should be given as much emphasis as the Ashridge Estate to retain the character of Berkhamsted and the entrance to the AONB.
- Changes to existing village boundaries should be considered to help accommodate future growth.
- Bourne End should be added to the list of designated villages to allow proposals for housing.
- Wigginton should be a conservation area as its surroundings are within the Chilterns AONB and include a key biodiversity area and a Special Area of Conservation.
- Raising awareness of the role of the countryside in food production and the public's responsibilities to help protect it.
- An abattoir in the locality would be beneficial.
- Should Bunkers Park be identified as an area to be protected as well as Gadebridge Park?

General Comments:

- The starting point for any policy development affecting the future role of the countryside is to recognize that it is a natural but managed environment providing jobs and homes. Its existing role and function can be enhanced without harming the key assets that make the countryside what it is.
- Preserving farming as a viable industry is in the best interests of the country and should be the main aim. Housing targets should not be followed where they are in opposition to the main aim.
- All types of hobbyists (cyclists, anglers and horseriders) should be treated equally: horses have been part of the landscape of the countryside for hundreds of years and cause no greater erosion to public paths or bridleways. We should encourage people to spend time in the countryside.
- The countryside needs to be properly defined. Is there a distinct line between settlements and the

countryside? The context maps does not make this clear.

Comments from Key Organisations:

Dacorum Environmental Forum:

The importance of farming on the ecology of the area needs to be recognised. Working farms, such as Cow Lane Farm and Dunsley Farm in Tring and Wayside Farms in Kings Langley, should be retained: they include two of the last remaining dairy farms in the county. The presence of active farms should be mentioned as constraints for development. The role of traditional mixed livestock farms within the countryside is important for landscape, biodiversity and amenity. Their loss presents a serious sustainability issue. Ensuring the sustainability of UK food supply is very important.

CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society:

With the new emphasis of food security, local foods and reducing food miles, economically viable food production should have higher priority.

The Ramblers :

They suggest policies for access to the countryside, countryside protection and for pedestrians. These set out requirements for :

- protecting and enhancing public rights of way within developments;
- ensuring safe and convenient access to routes in the countryside, and public transport links; and
- ensuring development proposals do not damage the character of the countryside.

British Waterways would like the strategy to reflect all users of the canals. “Canoeists, nature watchers and others” should be added to para. 1.23.

Appendix 1

Duplicate comments received on the Berkhamsted section of the consultation document.

Total number of forms received: 536.

Example of comments received:

Question 1

Do you agree with the vision for Berkhamsted?

If not, what else should be different?

Yes No

Comments:

It appears to suggest over development.

Question 2

Are there any additional key issues we should be considering?

Yes No

If so, please list.

Comments:

- Maintaining the character of an historical market town
- Overloading the infrastructure – all utilities, schools & services
- Considerable (additional) traffic congestion & resulting pollution
- Destruction of farmland
- Destruction of Green Belt

Question 3

Do you agree with this level of growth?

Yes No

If not, please give your reasons.

Comments:

- Maintaining the character of an historical market town
- Overloading the infrastructure – all utilities, schools & services
- Considerable (additional) traffic congestion & resulting pollution
- Destruction of farmland
- Destruction of Green Belt
- Maintaining the character of an historical town

Question 4

Do you agree that we should rule out the locations set out in Table 2?

Yes No

If not, then please give your reasons.

Comments: Reasons for rejection appear to be contradictory and inconsistent in that they could be said to apply to most, if not all of the sites under consideration

Question 5a

Do you prefer Option 1 for greenfield development in Table 3?

Yes No

If yes, please give your reasons.

Comments: I agree with the “cons” statements in the table

Question 5b

Do you prefer Option 2 for greenfield development in Table 3?

Yes No

If yes, please give your reasons why.

Comments: I agree with the “pros” in your table

Question 5c

Do you prefer Option 3 for greenfield development in Table 3?

Yes No

If yes, please give your reasons why.

Comments: Please refer to the “cons” listed in the table

Question 5d

Do you prefer Option 4 for greenfield development in Table 3?

Yes No

If yes, please give your reasons why.

Comments: In addition to the “cons” listed in the table, the density of the proposed development would seem to be substantially in excess of the existing locality and in contradiction to the key principle established in the Urban Design Assessment for peripheral areas in Berkhamsted

Question 6

Do you agree the approach to “Looking after the environment” of Berkhamsted outlined above?

Yes No

If not, then please give your reasons.

Comments: Whilst elements of your approach are consistent with my views, the proposed developments will prejudice the environmental strategy

Question 7

Do you think the Council should be more flexible in its approach to new development on school sites in the Green Belt?

Yes No

If not, please give your reasons.

Comments: Releasing playing fields and recreational ground for housing appears to be contradictory to the “Vision of Berkhamsted” and the “Emerging Core Strategy”.

Question 8

Do you agree that the existing employment areas should be safeguarded for employment uses?

Yes No

If not, please give your reasons.

Comments: Any redundant sites now and in the future could be re-classified for housing.

Question 9a

Should the British Film Institute be allowed to expand on its site?

Yes No

If not, please give your reasons.

Comments: It is within the Green Belt.

Question 9b

If the site is expanded should it consolidate development in one area of the site?

Yes No

If yes, please give your reasons.

Comments: The site should not be expanded.

Question 9c

If the site is expanded should it link site to possible greenfield development?

Yes No

If yes, please give your reasons.

Comments: The site should not be developed because it is within the Green Belt.

Question 10

Do you think we should continue to support the completion of the New Road / Springfield Road link?

Yes No

Please give reasons for your answer.

Comments:

There is already too much traffic congestion and this proposal would provide no benefit to an already congested town.

Question 11

Should the potential for new cycle routes in the town continue to be investigated?

Yes No

If not, please give your reasons.

Comments: None

Question 12

Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Berkhamsted?

Yes No

If yes, please add them here.

Comments:

The Spatial Strategy appears to be inconsistent with the vision for the town.

A key principle of the urban design for Berkhamsted is that peripheral zones should have “detached housing on large plots at very low density” as set out in Table 1 of the Spatial Strategy for Berkhamsted.

The Current suggestion of high density housing on the site abutting Coppins Close, Durrants Lane and Shooters Way contradicts the key principle of the Core Strategy (dated June 2009).

Development of the above site, especially when considered with other development options in this area outlined in the report, would lead to the following:-

- 1) Greater pressure on an already overstretched school system
- 2) Increase in traffic congestion and resultant pollution in an area which already cannot cope with peak-time traffic flows
- 3) Greater need for public transport which is currently absent from this area; leading to an increase in traffic movements
- 4) Distance from town centre will require travel to local amenities by car, leading to an increase in traffic movements
- 5) Destruction of the current “environmental corridor” along Shooters Way
- 6) Pedestrian/cyclist safety is already compromised by lack of pavement and this would be exacerbated
- 7) The current utilities infrastructure is already breaking down in this area (water pressure is low and sewage blockages are frequent) and this would be further exacerbated
- 8) Permanent loss of farmland will have a significant effect on local flora and fauna
- 9) The character of the existing neighbourhood would be lost forever with detrimental effect on the living environment of residents.