

# Appendix 2d

## Responses by Consultation point

23-Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

Delivery Strategy – Pages 2 to 181

23-Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

Pages 182 to 1184

23-Tring Delivery Strategy

Pages 1185 to 1789

23-Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

Pages 1790 to 1854

23-Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

Pages 1855 to 1907

23-Markyate Delivery Strategy

Pages 1908 to 1945

23-Countryside Delivery Strategy

Pages 1946 to 1997

# 23 Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy responses

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS60
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Policy SP14/15/16</b></p> <p><b>23.9/21/22/23/24.</b> Dacorum’s Local Plan and the HGC Programme will together deliver a minimum of 10,600 homes between 2020 and 2038 yet on the Key Development plan I see no landscaping, open space or conservation areas. <b><u>it looks just like wall to wall housing not in the up keeping with your Environment and Biodiversity policies</u></b></p> <p><b>23.47</b> Is this statement for real “<i>There are key issues to address as part of delivering new transport solutions for the town: enhance movement within existing areas to make them more accessible through the provision of safe, convenient walking and cycling connections particularly between the town centre, Maylands Business Park and the railways stations</i>”</p> <p>I just cannot imaging people walking from the train station to the town centre let alone from the town centre to Maylands business park. Where is the consensus from the populous of Dacorum that there is a requirement to provide substantial improvements in walking and cycling infrastructure? <b>23.53</b>“<u>In respect of acute care, much of the West Herts Hospital Trust (WHHT) estate across all three sites is in poor condition and in urgent need of investment. In July 2019 the Trust Board and Herts Valleys CCG Board signed off on the Strategic Outline Case for ‘The Future of Hospital Services in West Hertfordshire’. The business case identified a very strong case for change and sought funding to progress with a preferred way forward based on retaining an acute presence on all 3 of its current sites</u>”. Despite the West Hertfordshire Hospital NHS Trust (WHHT) proposal just to refurbish the old hospital sites this ideology is not supported by the majority of the people in West Herts. All the refurbishment program will do is turn these already overcrowded hospital into restrictive building sites causing more stress and frustration for patients. <b><u>Surely the idea of building a new modern fit for purpose, logistically placed hospital, even on a green field site, would be more beneficial to the populous of West Herts.</u></b></p> <p>Then once completed move the medical staff to the new hospital and then , if still required modernise the existing hospital</p>

sites of Watford, St Albans and Hemel. In Dacorum, Hemel Hempstead Hospital provides an urgent treatment centre and other local healthcare and outpatient facilities. **23.55** The proposed new crematorium at Bunkers Park will provided a much welcomed action to accommodate existing and future demand within Hemel Hempstead and the wider area. Along with the respectful and tranquility of the area.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS131

**Person ID** 1153917

**Full Name** Angela Whyte

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Ref.: 23.75 "a sustainable movement corridor linking Leighton Buzzard Road in the west to Redbourn Road to the east"

If the A4146 Leighton Buzzard Road is the main N/S link between Hemel and Leighton Buzzard, then I assume traffic will increase along this road particularly with the increase in the number of residents as a result of the proposed housing development in Hemel. In peak periods this road is already difficult to join from the side roads and safer traffic measures will need to be introduced.

With the likely increase of traffic using the A4146, I wish to register concern about the potential increase of traffic using Gravel Path in Berkhamsted as drivers seek to travel E/W through Potten End and Berkhamsted and to make their way to Berkhamsted train station. This route is unsuitable for a significant increase in the number and speed of cars and re-routing should be considered to encourage drivers to stick to alternative main routes.

For example, access to / from Berkhamsted, and in particular to the train station, from the east is better directed along New Road, rather than Gravel Path, since New Road is wider, not so winding and dangerous and not residential.

The Safer Gravel Path Action Group is already active in trying to reduce the speed of cars using Gravel Path and the number of accidents involving the railway bridge and vehicles at the crossroads with Station Road / Ravens Lane / Ellesmere Road are proof to the unsuitability of this road for anything other than local traffic. The Safer Gravel Path Action Group is planning submit comments to this Local Plan regarding the possible impact of increased housing on traffic in the Berkhamsted area.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS380

**Person ID** 1260058

**Full Name** Redbourn Parish Council

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1260042

**Agent Full Name** David Mitchell

**Agent Organisation** Redbourn Parish Council

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** The extensive use of the Greenbelt for development between Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead goes against the purposes of the Greenbelt as described in the NPPF. Specifically, the Hemel Garden Communities project will see urban sprawl into the Greenbelt and the narrowing of the gap between Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead. In addition, the extensive use of the Greenbelt will damage the local environment and ecology adding to the problems of climate change. On these issues, Redbourn Parish Council objects to the draft Dacorum Local Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS443

**Person ID** 1260496

**Full Name** Julie Wade

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please clarify if the proposed building is going to be on Grovehill playing field as this currently is still white on map and no white box on Key to map.</p> <p>This area is unsuitable for building of properties as the farmers field and into the playing field floods on a regular basis, If the building goes ahead the flooding will become worse and push flood water closer to our property in Wootton Drive. Councillor Alex Bhinder &amp; wife Julie Banks also back onto playing field and should be able to confirm this.</p> <p>The local area &amp; along link road is gridlocked in the mornings/evenings with commuter traffic and there is no provision for extra roads and public transport.</p> <p>The public foot paths in this area have been greatly used over the past year especially with current pandemic. Who knows how long we will have to live like this. Green spaces are supposed to be being preserved, not destroyed.</p> <p>The town centre currently has huge developments of flats and if there is such a need for housing how has it taken almost ten years to start building the proposed housing off the link road.</p> <p>I attach photos of the flooding.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt if ever our houses are subject to flooding due to flood waters being pushed further towards properties in Wootton Drive, we will take legal action and advise any insurers that Dacorum Council were made aware.</p> <p>I will also send email as only allows 1 upload of document</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">20210130_112459.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS470
<b>Person ID</b>	1258240
<b>Full Name</b>	Adele Giles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS610
<b>Person ID</b>	1261122
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS640
<b>Person ID</b>	1261183
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Fairfull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<p>Yes / No * Yes * No</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.</p> <p>My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.</p> <p>The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.</p> <p>Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity? You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan. It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.</p> <p>Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.</p> <p>These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.</p> <p>In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets</p>

are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS692

**Person ID** 1249904

**Full Name** Mrs Christine Ridley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

*23.9 Dacorum’s Local Plan and the HGC Programme will together deliver a minimum of 10,600 homes between 2020 and 2038 with transformative changes for Hemel Hempstead. At the same time an additional 4,300 homes and land for 8,000 jobs are being proposed to the East of Hemel Hempstead (in St Albans district), also supported by the HGC Programme. Beyond 2038 there is an opportunity for at a further 5,500 homes to be delivered around Hemel Hempstead in both St. Albans and Dacorum administrative areas (subject to a future Local Plan review). This takes the long-term development potential in and around Hemel Hempstead to over 20,000 additional homes by 2050.*

The plan fails to mention that most of this building will be on **Green Belt land**. This development is far too big and will be built on what is at the moment countryside. The above paragraph is written as though the Garden Community is going to be developed on a Brownfield site, and therefore its size doesn’t matter.

Of all the development, I find this proposal the most shocking. In no way is this a ‘*small-scale development*’ with ‘*modest levels of new build development*’. Although I am **not totally opposed to parts of this development being built**, such as the western section near the M1 planned in conjunction with St.Albans, the total number of houses planed **is far too**



**large** and the part which will spread down the side of the valley to the Leighton Buzzard Road will directly affect the beautiful views along the Gade valley. The biodiversity found in the farmland and adjacent ancient woodland, and probably that of the river Gade itself will be severely affected, as will the ancient settlements which this development will surround. This huge development will lead to an increase in the amount of traffic and pollution in the whole town and put more strain on our services. This certainly doesn't follow Policy DM27:

*'All development shall help conserve, restore or enhance the prevailing quality, character and condition of Dacorum's natural and historic landscape'*

I, together with a group of volunteers, help manage the Halsey Field Local Wildlife site on the other side of the Gade Valley in Gadebridge, and whenever anyone comes to visit the site, they all exclaim about how beautiful the view is across the valley (please see inserted photograph) This site is not officially in the ANOB, but the views are just as spectacular as those further up the valley. Local people sit for long periods on the bench we have installed, enjoying the view across this beautiful valley.

If plans for the Garden Community go ahead as planned, this amazing vista will be destroyed for ever, together with some of the historic interest, and much of the wildlife the land involved contains. The prevailing quality, character and condition of Dacorum's natural and historic landscape **will neither be conserved or enhanced**.

**23.63** *Four foundation pillars:*

- 1 **"A Green Network - A network of green routes, travel and places will support healthy lifestyles, biodiversity, climate resilience, environmental sustainability and the wellbeing of local communities."** There is no mention of how biodiversity or climate resilience will be realised here. Without a carefully planned strategy which is binding **this is just 'greenwash' which is meaningless**.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">P1150795 (2).JPG (1)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS752
<b>Person ID</b>	1261250
<b>Full Name</b>	Christina Thompson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS773
<b>Person ID</b>	1258939
<b>Full Name</b>	Ed Shedd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Comments on 23.9</b></p> <p>What level of review of the total number of housing will there be? And how regularly? We appear to be working on top down figures provided by Government, with the shape of the plan "set in stone". For instance the further 5,500 homes to be delivered post 2038 appear to be in the planning phase already, with infrastructure requirements taking into account this phase. So how will the future Local Plan review actually work in this context? More broadly how agile is this Local Plan, and how regularly will it be reviewed, and what impact will the reviews actually have?</p> <p><b>Comments on MOU Mission Statement</b></p> <p>Why is there no explicit reference to the environmental and health benefits that the Garden Communities are to deliver? There is a reference to the Garden City Principles, but other than that it just states that we will deliver over 11,000 homes and 10,000 jobs. It does not feel a compelling mission statement espousing the philosophy of the Garden Communities.</p> <p><b>Comments on 23.28</b></p> <p>The almost throwaway final bullet point "circular economy principles" is worrisome. Try as we may, we cannot understand how paragraph 23.28 will mitigate climate change. It talks about increased investment in digital economy, and building on the area's green tech expertise, but does not talk about what it might do to mitigate climate change impacts. The bullet points simply say what you are going to build and what Hemel's heritage skillsets are.</p> <p><b>Comments on 23.47</b></p>

Fully agree with the aspiration in this paragraph. To state the obvious, this will need much focus and planning and it is not clear how the plan can deliver these aspirations. How will the Region bring these plans to life and ensure that they are implemented as enthusiastically as more "known" transport solutions e.g. building new roads.

**Comments on 23.57**

The wording in this paragraph implies that renewable energy generation is a "nice to have", "will be considered in the future", as opposed to being planned and delivered in the short term. As with wording elsewhere in this document, what is "known" and "understood" has much more action oriented language attached to it. The newer, transformative initiatives are described in a much more nebulous way. There needs to be much greater detail on how the transformative initiatives will be put in place and when, with a key requirement that the region is committed to delivering these initiatives. At present, the language used simply does not inspire confidence that we will do anything other than repeat what has been done before.

23.63. Finally, we see a green initiative described in the active. "A network of green routes **will** support"..., as opposed to may, or could, or might. Fully agree that these are important to deliver and to deliver at the start of the Communities development.

23.64 It is joy to read these two crossover themes. The first time one finds paragraphs in the Local Plan which suggest that the Region will deliver tangible measures to mitigate climate crisis and promoting the resurgence of locally produced food.

Table 32. One comment. We are talking about the development of Garden Communities, digitally connected, with a green network allowing for better connectivity etc. etc, and yet whilst there is reference to public open space and a country part, the only transport solution outlined is the new road.

23.71 - "Sustainable travel will be given priority" So why is half this paragraph related to road programmes. This is a constant theme in this document. Green aspirations, with repeated tangible carbon / car economy programmes and solutions appearing first and foremost.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS887

**Person ID** 1261482

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr S Goold
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Although I think it's a good plan, I do think you have not thought about the fact that one little knock on the M.1. and Hemel is gridlocked and that would be even worst because of the extra people living here.</p> <p>Plus now we have lost our Hospital and at best it can take 45 mins to get to Watford hospital.</p> <p>We could then start getting perfect storms....lots more people, knocks on M1, rush hour and Hemel gridlocked.</p> <p>I could not sleep, knowing people's deaths could be happening, because of the above.</p> <p>I hope the Council and the planers, at least take there time think about the above, as they have made mistakes in the past, which has changed Hemel for the worst.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS905
<b>Person ID</b>	926372
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Nidd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The draft includes reference to removing, in advance of the existence of a Local Plan for the period beyond 2038 (the expiry date of the current draft Plan) tracts of land from Green Belt: for which no base evidential data exists. Green Belt is precious, and once it's gone it's gone forever; with no data to support its removal it must remain. The draft relies to a significant extent to the Hemel Garden Communities scheme which in turn relies in part on the recently-abandoned St. Albans Local Plan. It is hard to see any elements of Ebenezer Howard's "Garden Cities" thinking in the "Hemel Garden Communities" scheme, which appears largely to have been conceived as a way of getting Government money to fund a lot of consultancy work, all of it set against the "accelerated growth" agenda. The author spent half his working life as a consultant and is all too well aware of the way in which the client can "steer" the consultants' work.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS949
<b>Person ID</b>	1205804
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs B. Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	HH08 Station Gateway Although I am happy for this site to be developed because it is a brownfield site there are some issues with it. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The proposed buildings are too high rise and too dense</li> <li>2 There still does need to be parking for the station particularly in the light of the Covid-19 pandemic.</li> <li>3 There also needs to be somewhere for residents to park their cars</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS950
<b>Person ID</b>	1205804
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs B. Watson

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 HH09 National Grid Land This is a brownfield site that I would like to see developed but again there is an issue with it.</p> <p>1 The proposed height of the buildings is too high and there are too many flats. In the light of the Covid-19 pandemic it would be better if this development was less dense</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS951
<b>Person ID</b>	1205804
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs B. Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>HH10 Whiteleaf Road I am happy for this brownfield site to be developed but there is an issue.</p> <p>1 A building in this development has been half demolished for months and months creating an eyesore. (although due to the pandemic I have not driven past site for a year). Please can you make sure that this development is completed as soon as possible and not left in this dreadful state indefinitely.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1286
<b>Person ID</b>	1259116
<b>Full Name</b>	Tring in Transition (TinT)
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1340
<b>Person ID</b>	1145350
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Edward Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1349
<b>Person ID</b>	772477
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr. Roy Warren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Manager Sport England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Paragraph 22.42: Hemel Hempstead Infrastructure</p> <p>The section on Hemel Hempstead Infrastructure (pages 198-199) should out the strategic sport and leisure infrastructure needs of the area based on the recommendations in the Leisure Facilities Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy (e.g. need for additional swimming pool space, additional 3G artificial; grass pitches etc). This would be consistent with the approach taken to other community infrastructure types in this section.</p> <p>Policy SP16: North and East Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas</p> <p>Support is offered for Strategic Principle 2 of Policy SP16 as the principle of masterplans for individual phases of the growth areas needing to demonstrate how the total infrastructure requirements for the whole Garden Communities area will be provided and delivered is supported. This is because sport and leisure facilities are strategic facilities that serve large populations and therefore need to be planned strategically across the whole Garden Communities area rather than incremental provision being provided in individual phases which is not responsive to needs</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1438
<b>Person ID</b>	1262082
<b>Full Name</b>	MR DAVE WARD



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I received the Leaflet this week about the Local Plan.</p> <p>My concerns are with Grovehill area extension . There is issues I believe with the drainage for the new builds that will have an impact on the housing and transport links to Grovehill and surrounding housing areas.</p> <p>Also I believe there are too many new houses being built with not enough planned infrastructure to support the increase in population.</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead is becoming a dumping ground for all and sundry.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1519
<b>Person ID</b>	1262216
<b>Full Name</b>	George Godar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1645
<b>Person ID</b>	1262323
<b>Full Name</b>	Emma Hilder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1675
<b>Person ID</b>	1262338
<b>Full Name</b>	PAUL HARRIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am appalled that acres of green belt are being reclaimed for housing and development. The building on this land will cause major traffic congestion, pollution and will have a major impact on the local wildlife in an area of outstanding beauty.

The Leighton Buzzard Road/ Dagnall Road is already overused, the bridge at Water End cannot cope with the amount of traffic and is a hot spot for accidents.

The impact this development will have on the area will be catastrophic.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1925

**Person ID** 1262553

**Full Name** Henry Wallis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1981

**Person ID** 1262709

**Full Name** Adam Griffin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Delivery  
Strategy comment**

I wish to object to the proposed development as I am very concerned about the local development plan that you have published and the various impacts it would have on the parish of Great Gaddesden. I would also question the timing of this at a time, given the current government imposed lockdown, when it is impossible to practically engage the wider community in any form of real discussion.

The plan also has a number of inconsistencies in its approach and shows a lack of awareness and understanding of a number of fundamental issues.

The plan would, if allowed, result in the urbanisation of a parish that is predominantly composed of agriculture land and woodland and sits in an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). The proposed development would cover almost 18% of the parish and reach right to the border of the AONB demarcation line. Environmental impacts of sound and light and noise alone would do significant damage to the natural beauty of the AONB. There can be no hiding from the fact that the plan would have a very significantly detrimental effect on the green belt and also on the Chiltern's area of outstanding natural beauty.

The area is already suffering badly from the creeping urbanisation as littering and fly tipping and traffic have become major problems which are not being successfully addressed.

Whenever I drive through the borough I am struck by the potential number of brownfield sites available and although there is evidence that some thought has gone in to its utilisation we are at a stage of urban development when inner city retail sites are increasingly underutilised and occupied and could and should be used to boost the housing supply without further damaging the natural environment.

It appears to me to be vital that all brownfield options are fully explored and maximised before reducing the hard-pressed green belt land further.

The 'vision' refers to environmental sustainability but would result in the loss of some 2000 acres of green belt land and open spaces and the green spaces it promises will result in the loss of 900 acres of the existing green belt land which does not make any sense at all.

Although more housing is required I understand that the central government target that lies at the heart of this plan is out of date (2014) and was withdrawn and substantially lowered for the rest of the South East of England and I would

expect Dacorum to fight for the same degree of respite. More recent figures I gather show a much lower house building target requirement, approximately half that of the 2014 figure.

Even before I was aware of the plan, I had been worried about the behaviour of the water table in Gaddesden Row and had queried it with the Water Authority who said they had no responsibility for what happens to water issues on private land but failed to admit to the true nature of the problem.

Ponds that have existed for hundreds of years have been drying up each year and often remain dry through the winter and I now know this is partly a result of the long term over abstraction from our local River Gade which has of course impacted on the aquifer underneath us and lowered the water table very significantly. It has also put the surrounding beautiful chalk streams at risk. Further development can only put yet more pressure on this fragile resource and have a serious and permanent environmental impact.

The plan talks about 'developing the transport proposals' but currently the area this plan encompasses does not have any existing infrastructure and can only result in more road traffic on already overcrowded roads. If traffic is to be diverted away from the A414 during the construction of a mass passenger transport system toward the proposed new link road then the existing Dagnall Road at Water End (a single lane over a narrow bridge and scene of frequent accidents) would become totally congested.

The proposed link road with Junction 8 will compound the environmental issues and cause significant further environmental and real harm to the surroundings.

Dagnall Road would become yet another rat run for motorists fleeing the M1 congestion resulting in the road system would simply grind to a halt and the road system running through the parish and particularly Water End would become untenable. Walkers and cyclists would be at significantly greater risk and the already severe litter problem would become even worse in the area of outstanding natural beauty.

I believe the plan does not pay due attention to all of these very important issues and, at a time when there are talks about the area possibly becoming upgraded to a National Park, shows little regard for the understanding or appreciation of this beautiful area. It is working towards an out of date and overestimated housing target and is needlessly damaging to the environment.

For the above reasons I object strongly to the proposals and urge Dacorum to re-examine the proposals in the light of the known facts.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2148
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities DeliveryStrategy. Hemel Hempstead is better placed for development as the town has a better infrastructure and planned out areas and parks which were done in its development as a new town. Whilst bigger than Berkhamsted it has more green space accessible easily to the residents than Berkhamsted which has very little
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2153
<b>Person ID</b>	399537
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Featherstone
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Implications of withdrawal of St Albans submitted Local Plan</p> <p>The proposed local plan does not consider the impact of the withdrawal of the St Albans Local Plan</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The Strategy assumes that large areas of Green Belt land east of Hemel Hempstead and in St Albans District will be allocated for residential and employment development as part of the Hemel Garden Communities project. The St Albans Submission Local Plan has recently been withdrawn from Examination as the Inspectors advised that it would not be found 'sound'. The proposed sites north of Hemel Hempstead (5500dw) in Dacorum must be called into question if there is any doubt on the future viability of the Garden Community project as a whole.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2159
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2168
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Hemel Garden Communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development to the north of Hemel is based on a falsely perceived need to develop a large area of green belt</li> <li>The proposal includes a plan to build a new road from the junction of the M1 at junction 8 to the Hemel/Leighton Buzzard Road (B440). It is not clear where the junction with the B440 will be. The maps suggest somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water End. If it is south of Water End, the bridge at Water End can hardly sustain any more traffic and has a weight restriction on it.</li> </ul> <p>If the aim is for the traffic to go to Berkhamsted via Potten End or to Leighton Buzzard via the B440, both these possibilities would lead to unsustainable additional traffic pressure. If the proposal envisages a bypass of Water End, that will involve the additional land acquisition not provided for in these proposals and the destruction of an historic landscape.</p> <p>For traffic travelling north, the obvious route to avoid the bottleneck at Water End is to go via Nettleden and Little Gaddesden which would cause unsustainable disruption to these villages</p> <p>The B440 is not now a trunk road and there are several villages north of Water End which could not sustain the significant additional traffic that any new link road to the M1 would involve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the new road is not intended to be a link with the M1 but is intended to be an internal road servicing the new Hemel Garden Community, there will still be significant additional traffic generated on the B440, which will still have the effects outlined in 2 above.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2171
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Hemel Garden Communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development to the north of Hemel is based on a falsely perceived need to develop a large area of green belt</li> <li>The proposal includes a plan to build a new road from the junction of the M1 at junction 8 to the Hemel/Leighton Buzzard Road (B440). It is not clear where the junction with the B440 will be. The maps suggest somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water End, the bridge at Water End can hardly sustain any more traffic and has a weight restriction on it.</li> </ul> <p>If the aim is for the traffic to go to Berkhamsted via Potten End or to Leighton Buzzard via the B440, both these possibilities would lead to unsustainable additional traffic pressure. If the proposal envisages a bypass of Water End, that will involve the additional land acquisition not provided for in these proposals and the destruction of an historic landscape.</p> <p>For traffic travelling north, the obvious route to avoid the bottleneck at Water End is to go via Nettleden and Little Gaddesden which would cause unsustainable disruption to these villages</p> <p>The B440 is not now a trunk road and there are several villages north of Water End which could not sustain the significant additional traffic that any new link road to the M1 would involve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the new road is not intended to be a link with the M1 but is intended to be an internal road servicing the new Hemel Garden Community, there will still be significant additional traffic generated on the B440, which will still have the effects outlined in 2 above.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2179
<b>Person ID</b>	1262762
<b>Full Name</b>	Eric Dodman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2289
<b>Person ID</b>	488516
<b>Full Name</b>	mr hugh siegle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	North Hemel contains two land parcels, HH01 and HH02 which together can accomodate 5500 new homes. This represents a major opportunity to deliver the regeneration and sustainability strategies sought by the Council and should be brought forward for delivery in this Plan period rather than HH02 safeguarded for development post 2038.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2301
<b>Person ID</b>	610662
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Antony Harbidge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

<p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>The delivery strategies go hand in hand with the Housing Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, so BRAG would like to refer back to the windfall analysis, which is a fundamental part of how much growth Dacorum can accommodate.</p> <p>The table below illustrates the importance of how windfall calculations affects the amount of Green Belt release required to meet the 'non-target' of 922dpa.</p> <p>Currently there are two parcels of Green Belt in North Hemel, HH01 and HH02 with a total capacity of 5500 homes due to be released now, but 4000 of these homes held for future development.</p> <p>Based on last 14-year windfall average the requirement to build 2538 homes in the Green Belt could be accommodated comfortably in HH01/02 in this Plan period.</p> <p>If the more conservative view taken by the Council of a windfall average of 200dpa, the Green Belt homes requirement of 4450 can also be accommodated in HH01/02.</p> <p>The net effect is that DBC could achieve its target of 922dpa by releasing all of HH01 and HH02 now with the added benefit to Hemel that only this scale of development can bring and remove from the Plan the need to develop on Green Belt elsewhere in the Borough, a housing strategy that fully aligns with the current Core Strategy settlement hierarchy which was ratified by the planning Inspector in 2013.</p> <p>Of course, BRAG does not accept the 922dpa as a legitimate target, but if the Council truly believe the Hemel Garden Communities Vision:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Hemel Garden Communities: creating a greener, brighter, more connected New Town.</i></p> <p><i>In the heart of the Golden Triangle between Oxford, Cambridge and London, Hemel Garden Communities will grow and transform into a greener, more connected New Town, building on the best of its heritage and culture. Transformation of existing neighbourhoods and the wider area, and the creation of new neighbourhoods, will support healthy lifestyles for everyone. Hemel Garden Communities will be home to inclusive, integrated neighbourhoods connected by a green network, and thoughtfully designed places with engaged communities, all underpinned by digital connectivity, a self-sustaining economy and pioneering green technology driven by Herts Innovation Quarter.”</i></p> <p>then DBC should be moving heaven and earth to bring that vision to reality within the plan period and not safeguard the dream to 2050.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS2426</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1227518</p>
<p><b>Full Name</b></p>	<p>Mr John LOWRIE</p>

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	It seems odd to me that you are asking people to comment on the delivery plans when the infrastructure strategy has not been completed yet. How can we comment on traffic flows created by 5,000 extra homes when the studies into the effects have yet to be published. How can ask for CIL to be spent on Water End bridge bypass if the facts are not there to support any claims for or against. Hemel Garden Community project is built entirely on important green belt land. It seems to be that although it is too far from any existing infrastructure like rail links it is the 'easy' option to stick a massive housing estate on a green field with 5,000 houses and job done. The plan includes the creation of green spaces. Why? You have destroyed green belt land to create a green space. It doesn't make sense.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2509
<b>Person ID</b>	1261723
<b>Full Name</b>	David Matthews
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	None of the developments should contain properties above 4 stories. Hemel is not a high rise town. Yes we do have a few at the moment but they are out of character. You can't call it a 'Garden Town' if you are building so many properties and these properties are above 4 floors.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2613
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Hemel Garden Community (HGC) (23.6 – 19) envisages the development of 5,800 houses over the next 20+ years of which the majority fall within the parish of Great Gaddesden which currently has 450 houses spread across five hamlets in an area which is entirely either AONB or Green Belt; this represents an overwhelming and completely negative transformational change in the nature of the area.</p> <p>The plans envisage development right up to the AONB boundary and although we have been told that the development will be phased as it approaches the AONB to incorporate a country park and other open spaces we see no details of this in the Plan. It seems incongruous that Green Belt land is being withdrawn for development only for assurances to be made that some of it will be left “green”. Why withdraw the Green Belt in the first place?</p> <p>The Schedule of Site Appraisals for large Green Field sites of October 2017 for the equivalent Site HH-h1b North Hemel Hempstead (Phases 1 and 2) had under the Technical Studies Assessment "Exclude from further assessment and retain as Green Belt". What has changed?</p> <p>The proposed HGC site appears to be directly in conflict with the Council’s proposed Policy DM50.2.a which states that: “Locate development in areas that provide good levels of access to sustainable modes of transport and can make provision for its improvement.”</p> <p>This site lies between 4km and 8km from Hemel Hempstead station. In the absence of any transport plan it is impossible to see how this can be defined as having “good levels of access to sustainable modes of transport”.</p> <p>We have already expressed our significant concern at the impact and feasibility of the new link road from J8 of the M1 to Leighton Buzzard Road which forms part of the proposed development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2636
<b>Person ID</b>	1262337
<b>Full Name</b>	SALLY BENINGFIELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to vehemently oppose the proposal for the building of 1550 houses in Hemel Hempstead by 2038 and a further 4000 after 2038.</p> <p>Having lived in Water End for 47 years I have seen many changes to the local area and not many of these have had a positive effect.</p> <p>It is impossible to believe that the local council are seriously considering such a huge development during these extremely challenging times when green space has been found to be so important for people's wellbeing and mental health. It is quite clear that either no lessons have been learnt, if they have, they are being ignored. The plan fails to consider the likely impact of the coronavirus pandemic and the recent changes to planning which may free up more sites in town centres.</p> <p>There is absolutely no credible reason for green belt or areas of outstanding natural beauty to be compromised by such a hideous development, the surrounding villages in which people choose to reside because they are quiet (ish) these days will be destroyed beyond any recognition and this is totally unacceptable and simply cannot be allowed to go ahead.</p> <p>The narrower roads and small bridges in the area are not designed to cope with the huge levels of traffic such a huge number of houses would bring, not to mention the extent of both pollution and noise. The villages of Water End and Piccotts End would be destroyed and the residents' homelife shattered.</p>

The scale of this proposal can only have a significant and hugely detrimental impact on the natural environment which is vital and as Dacorum is lucky enough to be 60% green belt I feel it is essential that it stays that way and this proposed development should be shelved.

I thank you for taking the time to read my email.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2853

**Person ID** 1263104

**Full Name** charlotte grange

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

The modus operandi of the HGC concept concerns me - it seems to have a focus on outward expansion and decentralisation, treating the town as a large glorified bedroom for London commuters rather than a community into and unto itself. The further outward Hemel expands, the further people are from our town centre - bus routes are already a necessity for many estates, such as Gadebridge and Grovehill, due to the inaccessibility of the town centre from these places. To build even further from that, despite placing the necessary amenities locally, is to completely remove people from the actual centre of their community, with adverse effects - particularly in terms of mental health for older people who may feel isolated, and in terms of traffic pollution from those who would find it necessary to drive into town from such far flung estates.

Para 23.8 suggests that developing vast areas around the north and east of the town will act as a 'catalyst' for the regeneration that Hemel Hempstead so desperately needs. This will solely serve to decentralise and fragment an already large town, and place a vast amount of strain on local infrastructure. The real upheaval that Hemel needs is in its decrepit town centre, passed over by shoppers in favour of Watford, with its larger variety of shops and conveniences. Paras 23.40 and 23.41 acknowledge that growth will need to be supported by a 'vibrant town centre', however the proposal seems entirely compliant with the current state of the town centre - its language suggests that the town centre will simply continue to be 'a high profile shopping centre' and 'a distinctive, "best in class" modern town centre' when it is objectively

none of those things. The Marlowes Centre was an ailing white elephant even before the covid crisis, and shuttered shopfronts and tired, unattractive 1950s architecture. It is sad place to be and could massively benefit from a complete regeneration, which could follow on from the recent beautifully done and much appreciated regeneration of the Water Gardens. Integration of habitation with shopping - something already happening on the land near the Forum - is a brilliant way to create community. The Marlowes Centre, currently taking up a vast amount of space for little relative economic gain, could contribute far more positively to the local economy as a mix of habitation, shops, facilities, and community gardens.

The outward expansion proposed by HGC is contrary to this feeling of community and local Hemel identity, and is entirely unpopular.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2884

**Person ID** 1263425

**Full Name** Andrew Farrow

**Organisation Details** Nettleden with Potten End Parish Council

**Agent ID** 1253616

**Agent Full Name** Andrew Farrow

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2939

**Person ID** 1263377

**Full Name** Jane Messenger

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3053
<b>Person ID</b>	1261425
<b>Full Name</b>	Camilla Pascucci
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The DLP assumes that large areas of greenbelt land east of Hemel Hempstead and in St Albans District will be allocated for residential and employment development as part of the Hemel Garden Communities projection. The St Albans Submission Local Plan has recently been withdrawn from Examination as the inspectors advised that it would not be found 'sound'. The proposed sites north of Hemel Hempstead in Dacorum must be called into question if there is any doubt about the future viability of the Garden Communities project as a whole
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3151
<b>Person ID</b>	1012318

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Hennell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Area Planner Canal and River Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We note the various requirements to provide links to the Grand Union canal towpath, both from the Garden communities areas and Two Waters area. Any new residential or employment uses adjacent to the canal or likely to result in an increase in its use should recognise the benefits the canal towpath can bring and actively look at ways these benefits can be increased and improved upon. This could include improvements to the towpath to allow it to be more sustainable transport route but also include waterbased recreation and access facilities. Developers should contribute to the costs of improving and maintaining these facilities through S106 and CIL payments.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3155
<b>Person ID</b>	1263531
<b>Full Name</b>	ELEANOR TROTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	have lived in Hemel Old Town for thirty six years. Over the years I have seen new builds over the borough, much needed. To use site's in Maryland's is great.

You are now looking at covering green field with houses. This area is already becoming over crowded. During this pandemic year, we have been walking as advised. We go through Piccotts End then up Dodds lane away from people to stay distanced and safe.

The land either side of Dodds lane floods , so where will this go if they are covered with houses. London was so badly hit as it is so congested. With all these new developments the same will happen here.

I am aware there is a need for more houses but spread it out through the country,not only the South East.

Please leave us somewhere to walk away from crowds in the next pandemic as there surly will be one.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3404

**Person ID** 1263763

**Full Name** Adam Kindred

**Organisation Details** CBRE

**Agent ID** 1263757

**Agent Full Name** Adam Kindred

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Hemel Hempstead will accommodate at least 10,600 new homes, almost 65% of the Borough's total forecast housing supply. The sources of supply to deliver the 10,600 is from a combination of large town centre regeneration opportunities (Hospital Redevelopment, Station Gateway) and well as urban extensions.

There is no disputing that Hemel Hempstead is an appropriate location for growth in Dacorum, however, it is important that sufficient contingency is built into the Draft Local Plan to ensure that the extent of reliance on Hemel Hempstead does not compromise other objectives. A key component of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) is that Local Plans should *'be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change.'*

Town centre regeneration sites can be complicated and unknown factors at the allocation stage (e.g. remediation, viability) can often make such sites unviable to bring forward policy compliant levels of affordable housing. Such sites are often

complicated by their nature and history. For example, the proposed redevelopment of Hemel Hempstead Hospital may face potential changes in direction and timescales brought about by wider changes following the pandemic. More broadly, the changes being considered at Hemel Hempstead Hospital are not being driven in isolation, but form part of a wider interdependency with other hospitals (notably Watford and St Albans) that fall within the West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust.

It is also unclear how the suggested allocation for 450 new homes fits against the press-release published by the West Hertfordshire Hospital NHS Trust for the site:

*'Hemel Hempstead Hospital would become a planned medical centre, including a newly provided urgent treatment centre. The Hemel Hempstead facility would be redeveloped into a centre for looking after people with long term conditions and the next stage of planning will look at opportunities to bring additional primary care and community services onto the site. In this way the Hemel Hempstead site will become a hub for accessing a range of health and care services.'*

A number of the town centre sites included within the Draft Local Plan already benefit from site allocations through the Site Allocations DPD (July 2017), including the Hemel Hempstead Hospital. The lack of progress that has been made on these sites in the four years since the adoption of the site allocation document highlights the issue of significant reliance on town centre regeneration sites as a cornerstone of a delivery strategy for the Draft Local Plan.

Against the current uncertainty for the site, it is clear that the proposals in the Draft Local Plan for the Hemel Hempstead site do not meet the threshold of 'developable' as required by the NPPF (2019). To be 'developable' sites should *'should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.'*

We are unaware of any clear, justifiable evidence to support there being reasonable prospects that the site will be available at the point envisaged with no public statement from West Hertfordshire Hospital NHS Trust to confirm the potential for significant residential development on the site.

Similarly, in respect of the Station Gateway proposals – masterplanning and vision work was commissioned by Dacorum Borough Council as early as 2011 to help in developing a vision for the site. 10 years later no progress has been made in realising the opportunity.

Omission Site 89 (Hill Farm) (as further detailed in response to Question 5a) offers an opportunity to add contingency into the early years of the plan which will assist in the advancement of a sound local plan. The site, unlike sites associated with Hemel Hempstead, is significantly less constrained and could be delivered within the first five years of the Plan. The site is in a single landownership and not subject to legal restrictions or covenants that would prevent the site coming forward early for development. No significant infrastructure upgrades are required to facilitate the development. The landowner of the site has led the sensitive redevelopment and enhancements of the adjacent Hill Farm and associated dwellings, emphasising the landowner's commitment to quality in design and placemaking. Moreover, there are not considered to be any obstacles to prevent a policy compliant level of affordable housing being brought forward on the site.

The lack of constraints associated with the site is also reflected in the 'Green Scores' provided in the Site Selection Report – Appendix B (2020) for the themes of access, utilities, ecology and flooding.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3439
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Comment: It is disappointing to see no specific mention of sporting facility development when referencing infrastructure development for Hemel Hempstead. There are clearly identified deficiencies in sporting facilities for the existing population of Hemel. This will be seriously exacerbated with the vast increases in population proposed in this Local Plan. Therefore, there needs to be due consideration given to identifying and supporting all opportunities for development of new sporting facilities and expansion of existing facilities; plus identification of space for the location of such new developments,</i></p> <p><i>All proposed new sporting developments should be designed and planned in partnership with local community clubs and organisations that will be the users of such facilities and can provide ongoing sustainable development, maintenance, stewardship and management. Developers and DBC (via DSN) should be encouraged to seek out local clubs/partners to work with on such projects.</i></p> <p><i>As stated in the HGC Charter this is a “once in a generation opportunity to have a transformational impact on Hemel Hempstead”. If HGC is to create inspirational new communities and deliver exemplar infrastructure and community facilities, then sport and leisure should be a key element of its Structured Delivery Plan (SDP).</i></p> <p><i>The size and scale of the HGC developments provides significant opportunities for major new sporting hubs to be created – perhaps in association with the proposed country parks or as gateways to these. In addition, the requirement for open spaces and community centres within the individual communities of HGC can be facilitated by and developed by sports clubs (see below).</i></p> <p><i>This would be in keeping with many of DBC’s HGC Charter principles and strategies including “Active Local Stewardship”, “Innovative Approaches to Delivery” and “Vibrant Communities”.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS3738
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3983
<b>Person ID</b>	1261840
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4016
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4134
<b>Person ID</b>	1264210
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	myself
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264200
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden communities strategy on the legal advice that it would not be 'found sound' which then rather puts the Hemel section of this joint strategy into question The assumptions in this section of the local plan therefore need revisiting

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4157
<b>Person ID</b>	1262892
<b>Full Name</b>	Jean Farrer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4330
<b>Person ID</b>	1264321
<b>Full Name</b>	David` Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	personal
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264318
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4348
<b>Person ID</b>	1264325
<b>Full Name</b>	Olivia Halper
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Strategy should be named 'Hemel Garden Communities Delivery Strategy' (remove 'Hempstead').</p> <p><u>Key developments in whole of HH map on p193:</u></p> <p><b>This map is highly problematic for a number of reasons and needs to be rethought:</b></p> <p>Roads are the most prominent feature on this map – this is not the message about growth that the spatial strategy should be sending.</p> <p>The land use categorisation used in the legend sends wrong messages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are very few 'landscaping' areas on the map. This is misleading, as in fact landscaping is distributed throughout HH and new development areas. Suggest remove altogether as new landscaping cannot yet be identified.</li> <li>• The growth areas are labelled with the 'New housing' symbol, however these will also include new local centres. Whilst acknowledge that the location, size and nature of these local centres will be determined through the HGC Framework Plan and other masterplans, it would be helpful to show on the map that new local centres will be created here, and that the HGC growth areas are not only residential use.</li> <li>• New employment will also be distributed in local centres as well as employment areas; this map does not show this and therefore conflicts with the LP's employment strategy.</li> <li>• 'What is mixed growth area'? This isn't a standard terminology nor is it defined anywhere in the plan. North and East HH are mixed-use new neighbourhoods areas, so shouldn't they be identified as such rather than 'housing'?</li> </ul>

There is an area shown as a housing allocation to the east of the M1 J8 – this should be removed as this land is not allocated for housing development and is not intended to be developed.

As with previous comments, it's important to clarify on the map using colours or symbols, legend labels and in the supporting text that the Growth Area at Land at East Hemel is not allocated for development – it is not possible or appropriate to allocate land outside the plan area. Instead it should be shown as an indicative location for growth. The exact amount of growth to be delivered at LEHH up to 2038 and beyond is not fixed.

Boundary needs to say DBC and SADC boundary.

-----

23.6-2.37: the paragraphs are repetitive. A better narrative would be to explain the programme and partners, then the bid and MHCLG support. See text here:

<https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/planning-development/planning-strategic-planning/hemel-garden-communities>

23.7: The definition of the programme area is incorrect. the HGC Programme Area is the North and East Hemel Growth Areas + town of HH and strategic sites + wider connections. This needs to be clearly set out (and it will help paragraph 23.8 below).

23.8: It is confusing to bring in Spatial Vision with no context. The text as written also suggests that the SV is only guiding transformation, not growth. Rather, say that the partners have produced a spatial vision to guide growth and transformation.

23.9 The first sentence makes it sound as though HGC programme and Local Plan operate separately. HGC Programme is working within the LP. Suggest simplify by saying that 'overall, a minimum of 10,600 homes will be delivered....'

23.10 'HGC Delivery Board' is the correct abbreviation to use, not HGCDDB. Suggest replace this text with: 'The HGC Delivery Board was formed by the partner organisations in 2019, underpinned by an MOU which provides a high-level commitment to collaborate on strategic issues to deliver HGC.'

23.14-23.15: the order of the paragraphs should be swapped, as 23.15 refers to the overarching, whereas 23.14 refers to one part of this. 23.14 could be demoted to a bullet point under 23.15.

23.16 need to specify which Hemel growth areas.

23.19 Not clear what this sentence means.

23.24 The second sentence referring to 4,300 homes to be delivered at Land at East Hemel Hempstead in St Albans District should be amended to reflect that this is an aspiration, subject to the forthcoming SADC Local Plan.

23.40 Town centre should also be an employment location.

23.45 Modal shift is also key to responding to the climate crisis and making more attractive places which support healthy lifestyles. This needs to be stated here – transport interventions are not just reactive response to growth, but are proactively seeking to deliver something.

23.46 'The HGC Programme' not 'we' has the strategy underway.

23.47 again, health and wellbeing is central to transport improvements.

23.48 not 'deliver' but 'achieve' modal share targets. Update bullet point to make point that network of MMTIs serves the whole of the town – existing and new neighbourhoods.

23.51 The exact requirements for schools – primary and secondary, the number, size and distribution / location across the HGC area is subject to further IDP work and the HGC Framework Plan, and the requirements and detail here should be revisited once the findings of these work streams conclude.

-----  
HGC Vision:

HGC Vision: Update by replacing text with the following:

**'Hemel Garden Communities: creating a greener, more connected New Town.**

In the heart of the Golden Triangle between Oxford, Cambridge and London, Hemel Garden Communities will create new neighbourhoods and transform existing ones and the wider area, building on the best of its heritage and culture to become a greener, more connected New Town.

The vision is organised into four thematic pillars, all of which reinforce the aspirations to **promote healthy lifestyles** and **respond to the climate crisis**.

Hemel Garden Communities will be home to inclusive, **integrated neighbourhoods** connected by a **green network**, and thoughtfully designed places with **engaged communities**, all underpinned by digital connectivity, **a self-sustaining economy** and pioneering green technology driven by Herts Innovation Quarter.'

23.63 Engaged Communities – text update to: 'Connected and engaged communities will be active participants in the transformation of Hemel Garden Communities. Cultural and heritage activity, public art, knowledge and skill exchange and enterprise will all play a role, now and in the long term.'

23.64 Two crossover themes have been updated as follows: 'Climate Crisis Response – including net carbon zero, biodiversity net gain, circular economy'; 'Healthy lifestyles – including active travel, engagement with culture and heritage, inclusive, vibrant communities, food growing'

-----  
Delivering Growth and Transformation subheading: this section needs to be much clearer about the studies that the HGC Programme has/is producing and how these will guide growth and transformation, as well as the aspects which are to be directly delivered by the Programme. These include:

- Phased development is to be guided by HGC Spatial Vision and Charter, other design guidance, delivery strategies and plans (includes TCPA principles, SDG, Transport Plan, Transformation Plan, Programme Delivery Strategy and Plan (includes viability)
- Using the phased development to catalyse infrastructure delivery for the whole town
- The HGC Programme will also be delivering interventions unlocking significant growth in solar power use, digital connectivity and a LoRaWAN network for open data sharing platform, amongst others.

23.65 Spatial Vision is the key document underpinning the programme; Transformation Plan is, as suggested in the name, the key document focusing on the transformation of the existing town.

23.66 Sentence is unclear and not helpful – the overarching, agreed agenda is HGC. If needing to talk about a challenge, talk about alignment and leveraging growth to deliver transformation.

23.66 and 23.69 need to be strengthened. Avoid use of the word ‘aspiration’ for capturing benefits and enable town-wide investment; *this is a central purpose of the HGC Programme.*

23.71: Support the sustainable transport, walking and cycling proposals. Additional text should be included to reflect the proposed circular green corridor along the A4147, A5183 and the Nickey Line as shown on the Pillar 1 Green Network plan in the Spatial Vision. This link is vital for enabling cycling journeys between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead including the Growth Areas to deliver the modal share shift.

23.76: As previously mentioned, we question whether there would be benefit in this site being allocated for development in this Plan-period, rather than being safeguarded.

#### SP14:

- Concept Masterplan should refer to Framework Plan
- 'guiding principles' is vague, need to specify.
- It may be more effective to include the more detailed policy requirements for the HGC area into this policy rather than doubling up in the later chapter, which may be confusing to the Plan user.

#### SP15:

A phasing strategy for North and East Hemel Growth Areas needs to be based on maximising the potential to leverage external funding for infrastructure delivery. This is currently not evident in the policies and narrative. The HGC Team seek to ensure that the Local Plan has enough flexibility to enable North Hemel phase 2 to be brought forward for development and/or infrastructure delivery within the Local Plan period if this can unlock growth and investment. On this basis, we query whether North Hemel Phase 2 should indeed be safeguarded for development for the next plan phase, or included as an allocation in this plan.

Map on page 206:

All comments on map on p193 apply here. Also, we query the location and number of schools identified for Land at East Hemel Hempstead. This needs to be revised to reflect latest understanding about need, and will be considered as part of the HGC IDP work and HGC Framework Plan. Two schools at LEHH is not SADC's current understanding of the requirement.

#### SP16:

The general approach to this policy and the strategic principles is supported in principle. However the nature or detail of any such equivalent policy in the emerging SADC Local Plan cannot be determined at this stage. Regard will be had to this emerging policy in the preparation of the new SADC Local Plan.

The wording of the policy should be amended to reflect either the requirements of the policy on development proposals and applicants, or set out requirements for the local authorities or other partners. For instance, Parts 1 and 2 of the Policy state that development will not deliver masterplans and design codes – this should be amended to state that: “Development Proposals must be designed and delivered in accordance with/compliant with/in general conformity with Masterplans and Design Codes. Masterplans and Design Codes will be prepared by landowners/applicants in collaboration with the Local Planning Authorities etc...”

SP16 1. Add: and will be required to show how they contribute to the Spatial Vision, TCPA and HGC Charter principles.

SP16 2. Concept Masterplan should be Framework Plan.

SP16 3. Remove reference to DDG. Replace ‘built and public realm’ with ‘built and natural environment, including public realm’.

The reference to ‘Best Practice’ is likely to be difficult to define as a standard. It may be more appropriate as follows: “development proposals will be of the highest quality in terms of...”

SP16 4-5. More emphasis needs to be placed on the importance of sustainable modes of transport within and between Hemel Garden Communities including the important role that MMTI’s will play in the uptake of sustainable modes of transport to achieve a 60% mode share by 2050. The fourth bullet point within the policy needs to be re-worded accordingly to reflect this. The evidence for the 60/40 split (or what it becomes) will be available later this year. In addition the evidence base which can be referenced to support a shift to sustainable modes is LTP 4. Here are the some comments from the HCC response which are relevant:

Transportation matters within the local plan, must be in conformity with Hertfordshire’s Local Transport Plan 2018-2031 (known as LTP4), which was adopted by the county council in May 2018. LTP4 outlines the county council’s transport policy by providing a policy foundation for a balanced approach to transport and consistently promoting and enabling sustainable transport and sustainable travel behaviour, in order to support better economic, social, and environmental outcomes for the county in a context of growth.

LTP4 key messages are as follows:

- Supporting and enabling a shift to sustainable transport;
- Policy, design and decision-making based around the Transport User Hierarchy which means prioritising, planning and designing first for reducing need to travel, people walking and cycling, and then public transport, ahead of other motorised vehicles;
- Enabling walking and cycling including through infrastructure improvement and increasing priority of people walking and cycling (policies 7 and 8);
- Supporting bus services through infrastructure including bus priority measures (Policy 9);
- Travel/Traffic Demand management.

SP16 4. MMTIs will be more widespread than those identified; use the words ‘including at’.

SP16 6. Rephrase: ‘Facilitate the development of a circular economy’

SP16 7. Inclusion of additional wording to Part 7 to strengthen the policy wording: “Ensure that infrastructure is provided at a rate and scale to meet the needs that arise from the proposed development in accordance with the HGC Infrastructure...” . Replace ‘HGC Transformation Plan’ with ‘HGC Framework Plan’.

GAP: biodiversity net gain targets to be defined by the Programme will need to be met.

We note that Affordable Housing policy requirements are included in Policy DM2 Affordable Housing, however there may be a bespoke approach to HGC - including principles on delivery, mix of tenures, management and nomination rights - and the delivery strategy wording needs to convey this,.

Inclusion of additional wording in the final part of the policy to provide additional flexibility in how Masterplans for the Growth Area can be used, and given weight, before adoption of the Plan. For instance “A masterplan for the whole of the Growth Area will be prepared and endorsed as a material consideration for planning applications and/or adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.”

The reference to Design Codes could be strengthened. Design Codes shouldn’t merely ‘inform’ planning applications – rather that planning applications must be in accordance with endorsed or adopted Design Codes.

-----

Map on page 210: Only roads are shown; this doesn’t do justice to the MMTI and walking/cycling route proposals for the town centre.

23.78 Have these walking and cycling routes been implemented? Repetition from 23.80.

SP17 1. Community facilities should be added.

SP17 7. This part makes reference to a MMTI to connect the centre and station with North Hemel Growth Area which is supported. However the Policy should also include a requirement to make provision for sustainable transport connections to the East Hemel Growth Area. It is vital that fast and convenient sustainable travel options are provided to provide access to the station and town centre from East Hemel Growth Area and Maylands/Herts IQ if the modal share ambition and transformation ambition is to be met. How this transport requirement is to be met will be explored further in the Transport Plan work and the HGC Framework Plan work, however a policy requirement is needed here to secure this.

Map on page 213: Comments on Map on p210 apply to this map.

23.86 Need to specify where the transport infrastructure improvements are linking to (i.e. key places in Hemel Hempstead and wider area).

-----

Map on page 216: Comments on all previous maps regarding depiction of transportation and land uses apply.

It is misleading to show Maylands in isolation of the North and East Hemel Growth Areas. The small inset map also does not include any new growth areas. This must be corrected.

As previously mentioned, this map also needs to clearly show that the employment area identified for the extensions to Maylands/HertsIQ is not allocated in this Plan, but is an indicative proposal coming forward in the neighbouring St Albans District. The current map shows the orange allocation the same as other employment allocations in the area which are in DBC district.

-----

23.91 This paragraph needs to make clear what Herts IQ is, and that it is within SADC. It currently is ambiguous where Herts IQ is.

SP19 2. Need to make clear that the integration is functional and also about physical connectivity. The sentence reads as incomplete.

SP19 6. Should this read 'deliver improved connections to the Nickey Line'?; also include improving connections to places around HH such as Redbourne and the countryside.

-----

Map on page 219: Comments on all previous maps regarding depiction of transportation and land uses apply.

We can see the intention of removing the town centre and other HH areas from this map, to highlight 'rest of HH', but this makes it look like these areas are green/open space and is very confusing/misleading. The same intent would be better achieved by using the more standard technique of adjusting opacity of different areas of the map so that the focus area stands out.

This map would be improved with some labels so that the reader could identify the different housing allocations, and where the town centre is.

-----

23.95 This section would be strengthened by including the intent to strengthen Hemel's existing neighbourhoods/upgrade them for C21 with windfall and infrastructure delivery. Otherwise it reads as though the rest of HH is an afterthought and lacks a strategy.

23.96 Is it true to say that development will be 'directed towards' the following locations? These are the allocated sites for development. Development proposed elsewhere, if appropriate for the area in question, wouldn't be directed towards these sites... need to rephrase.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4388
<b>Person ID</b>	1261609
<b>Full Name</b>	DEBORAH CROOKS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4403
<b>Person ID</b>	1264352
<b>Full Name</b>	Margaret Gibson & Richard Powell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As residents of Dacorum living in Great Gaddesden we are writing in response to the proposed DBC Strategy for development. We have a number of concerns about its impact on the local environment.</p> <p><b>Housing provision.</b></p> <p>We are concerned that the Strategy appears to be based on out of date ONS statistics rather than the more recent 2018 statistics. This has resulted in a considerable over-estimate of housing needed in the area. We understand that using the 2018 statistics would halve the amount of housing predicted to be required each year. This one correction alone would mean much less impact on the local environment, much of which is Green Belt, and would be less likely to jeopardise</p>



the recent proposals to upgrade the Chilterns AONB to a National Park. The proposed Strategy may well threaten the AONB status if movements through the area increase significantly as seems inevitable with the current Plan.

The proposed new housing areas to the NorthWest of Hemel are far from the existing transport and other infrastructure. The Strategy amazingly looks to an increase in cycling, walking and passenger transport to enable residents to access that infrastructure. This ignores the geography of this area; it is an area of hills so most people will choose to use a car. Central Hemel is already suffering significant congestion and large housing developments in the proposed areas will clearly increase it. The Plan does not set out how this will realistically be dealt with.

### **B404/Dagnall Rd congestion**

The Dagnall/Hemel Hempstead Road is a rural road with a single lane, weight-limited bridge that is a bottle neck at Water End. Traffic volumes are already an issue at rush hour causing long holdups. The increased traffic from the proposed housing provision as it stands would make those hold ups much worse and make communications and access for the outlying communities, dependent on this route, a very significant problem.

The proposed new link road from the B404 to the M1 would inevitably produce a large increase in traffic on the B404 and the minor roads heading off the B404 towards Berkhamsted and Tring. These roads are not suitable for any increase in traffic and are not suitable for upgrading. The Strategy appears to export traffic congestion from Hemel to these minor roads and the rural communities such as Great Gaddesden and Potten End.

In short the local road network does not have the capacity for the proposed development.

### **Natural Environment**

We are fortunate in having one of roughly 180 chalk streams in the world running through the Gade valley. The water meadows around it are one of the most significant natural features of the area. Laudable efforts to restore the river by DBC and others after years of what was, at best, neglect (eg licensing a waste site next to the river at Bishops field and then neither checking what was dumped there or enforcing the provisions for topsoil replacement; out of date abstraction licences given to the water company which have allowed it to abstract at the expense of the river flow ) would be undermined by this development.

When I spoke to a water company representative a year ago about the (lack of ) water in the Gade - it having dried up almost as far down as Pipers Hill Road - he said they were charged with providing water required by developers. They were not allowed to say " We can't do it without damaging the river/aquifer". If this is correct it is up to those developing this Strategy to question the water authority about the where the water required will come from and to then consider the

impact of hugely increased abstraction on the Gade and wildlife around it, as the water authority remit does not extend to stopping inappropriate and damaging proposals.

### Summary

Realistically the proposed Strategy will impact the natural environment of the Gade valley. This is something that is not replaceable once gone. In disappearing the fields on the sides of the Gade valley, increasing traffic volumes on minor roads, abstracting far more water than is sustainable the Plan appears to be more about putting large housing developments on empty spaces on a map rather than a closely thought out scheme. This is simply not in the interests of the inhabitants of the area and will be detrimental to their environment.

We ask you to reformulate the Strategy taking into consideration these reservations and objections.

### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
--------------	--

<b>ID</b>	EGS4499
-----------	---------

<b>Person ID</b>	1264395
------------------	---------

<b>Full Name</b>	R Jane Dickson
------------------	----------------

### Organisation Details

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
---------------------------	--

<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	If the number of additional houses required is adjusted in line with more recent figures, then taking such a large area of Green Belt land adjacent to the Chilterns AONB would not be necessary.
---	---

### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
--------------	--

<b>ID</b>	EGS4535
-----------	---------

<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4565
<b>Person ID</b>	1262255
<b>Full Name</b>	AJ W
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Why are HH01& HH02 green belt release being held back for future development? Releasing them now would mean that DBC can more reasonably reach its (non target) without using greenbelt land around Berkhamsted, this also maintains alignment with the 2013 core strategy. Again, please do not allow developers to lead this growth plan, DBC should be the ones using this growth strategy as an opportunity to protect greenbelt land
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4735
<b>Person ID</b>	1264485
<b>Full Name</b>	Charlotte Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This plan has flawed calculations and projections leading to a delivery strategy that prioritises building on green belt over brownfield and urban areas
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4758
<b>Person ID</b>	1264510
<b>Full Name</b>	Martin Evening
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The DLP assumes that large areas of greenbelt land east of Hemel Hempstead and in St Albans District will be allocated for residential and employment development as part of the Hemel Garden Communities projection. The St Albans Submission Local Plan has recently been withdrawn from Examination as the inspectors advised that it would not be found 'sound'. The proposed sites north of Hemel Hempstead in Dacorum must be called into question if there is any doubt about the future viability of the Garden Communities project as a whole

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4768
<b>Person ID</b>	1264462
<b>Full Name</b>	Penny Clifton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5074
<b>Person ID</b>	1264258
<b>Full Name</b>	Fintan FitzPatrick
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5096
<b>Person ID</b>	211327
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sara Leno
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Paragraph 23.26 and paragraphs 23.39 to 23.42. With Covid having decimated the retail and hospitality sectors, and paragraph 23.26 saying that the Town Centre is no longer an office centre it is difficult to see how the proposals will be achieved.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5124
<b>Person ID</b>	1250013
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Nikki Bugden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Clerk Nash Mills Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are concerned that the proposed housing development on the periphery of Nash Mills (i.e. sites in the Leverstock Green area, sites near to Junction 8 of the M1 plus increased employment at Maylands) will significantly impact the minor roads through Nash Mills. These include Bunkers Lane which is very narrow for much of its length, Chambersbury Lane and Georgewood Road which are primarily residential, plus Barnacres Road, Belswains Lane and Red Lion Lane which are heavily used through routes already with much congestion at peak times. Additional traffic would be likely to cause harm by way of increased congestion and vehicles travelling at unsafe speeds for residential areas.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5165
<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5178
<b>Person ID</b>	1264509
<b>Full Name</b>	Hannah Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5231
<b>Person ID</b>	1264608
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Beadle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5299
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5471
<b>Person ID</b>	1264363
<b>Full Name</b>	Roselyn King
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	You say that the proposed developments aim to create a greener New Town, but destroying large areas of the countryside to build housing in North and East Hemel will have the very opposite effect. Nor will the creation of these new neighbourhoods "support healthy lifestyles for everyone" because they will be destroying areas where many people currently walk, cycle or jog and will make it significantly harder for the residents of Piccotts End, Grovehill and Woodhall Farm to access the countryside and the mental health benefits of spending time in the countryside. If you were to go door-to-door in these three neighbourhoods, explaining your proposals and asking people for their views, I'm sure you would encounter strong opposition to your plans.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5492

<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5508
<b>Person ID</b>	1264048
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Housing must not be high density and all houses should have a decent garden. The new estates must have decent sized parks and green corridors.</p> <p>I would also question that that many homes are going to be needed in Hemel Hempstead, (Brexit and Covid, more people working from home may mean people can live in less expensive parts of the country and won't want to move to Dacorum). Furthermore why are St Albans being allowed to build houses that will be essentially more in Hemel than St Albans?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5559
<b>Person ID</b>	1264491
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5684
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5705
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5797
<b>Person ID</b>	1261255
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Lightfoot
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1261248
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Sarah LIGHTFOOT
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	BRAG has responded to this strategy clearly and in detail - I endorse their comments. The Hemel Garden Community should be included in its entirety in the current plan. This will enable a comprehensive, rather than piecemeal approach and - if the vision is to <i>act as major catalyst for the transformation of the town</i> - it should

not wait for some unspecified time beyond 2038. It is the opportunity for DBC to do something outstanding to enhance Hemel.

Romoving large swathes of Green Belt now and altering the nature of the historic town of Berkhamsted, while holding back development of 4000 homes, cannot meet a justification of 'exceptional circumstances'.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5890

**Person ID** 1264752

**Full Name** Chris Brown

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5893

**Person ID** 1264354

**Full Name** Juliet Penaliggon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6056
<b>Person ID</b>	1264797
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	23.9 - why hold back housing for beyond 2038? this seems illogical.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6207
<b>Person ID</b>	1264872
<b>Full Name</b>	Ben Penaliggon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6217
<b>Person ID</b>	1264875
<b>Full Name</b>	Kate Bellingham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	A feature of the Hemel 'New Town' was distinctive communities separated by green swathes (bigger than what are traditionally called 'wildlife corridors'). Examples are Scrubhill Common, Warners End Valley and Gadebridge Park. While the new areas to the north and east of Hemel are described as having 'landscaping', this suggests much less communal open space. We only need to look at the impact of the pandemic to see how fortunate many of us in Hemel have been to be close to large open spaces, including the canal side and Boxmoor Trust land. Developers will be loathe to guarantee this kind of open wild-life friendly area. It is vital that this character is maintained - for residents old and new, and for wildlife and sustainability goals.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6262

<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6407
<b>Person ID</b>	1264750
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6489



<b>Person ID</b>	1264936
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Cracknell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6526
<b>Person ID</b>	1264959
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wasn't aware of this plan until my mother told me about it today (28th Feb). I live in Grovehill and haven't had any leaflet drops about this plan. So I haven't time to read and comment on the plan fully. I am not happy that you are getting rid of beautiful countryside and replacing it with houses. How can you build on greenbelt? How is this allowed? Grovehill is high density and what makes it a nice place to live is all the countryside on our doorstep. With the new developments Grovehill is going to become more like an inner-city area. Who is going to be able to afford to live there anyway? I'm a homeowner and would not be able to afford to move to a more expensive property (the ones that are still for sale at Upper Bourne End are over £500,000 and other new homes in Dacorum on infills are even more expensive). Wages

are stagnant and with taxes, either income or more hidden, likely to rise to pay for the pandemic who will be able to buy the houses that are not 'affordable'? I have been working from home during the pandemic and am likely to be able to at least do some of my work from home after the pandemic. Therefore, a move away from Dacorum to somewhere cheaper (for example Bedfordshire) and less built up would make more sense, than buying what is likely to be an overpriced new home in Dacorum. It is affordable homes that are needed for people that have been unable to save due to high rents. I'm not sure where your evidence is that sufficient numbers of people will want to and be able to afford to live on the new estates; particularly those above Grovehill and Woodhall Farm. I hope that homes do not get built on the greenbelt and only if there is a genuine need after brownfield sites have been built on first. We have a green belt for a reason.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6597

**Person ID** 1263462

**Full Name** Bourne End

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** It seems premature to embark on yet another invasion of the green belt disguised as a garden community when brownfield sites and regeneration sites remain unaudited, for example the office demand affected by covid 19 changes in working practices.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6623

**Person ID** 1265007

**Full Name** Duncan Brown

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6814
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6858
<b>Person ID</b>	1261827
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Brener
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This is an awful way of getting a response from ordinary citizens. The document is over long and unreadable. It is ridiculous and irresponsible that this is happening during such an unprecedented crisis for our country. I can't believe that this is legitimate.</p> <p>I endorse the response from the CCG</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6860
<b>Person ID</b>	1265006
<b>Full Name</b>	Tracy Bownes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed additional housing in Hemel Hempstead is significant. Of particular concern is how the transport routes in Hemel support the additional population, employment and movement.</p> <p>The plan references, "a strategic sustainable movement corridor linking Leighton Buzzard Road in the west to Redbourn Road (within SADC) to the east." The plan does not, however, highlight this on the planning maps, instead referencing it for the first time in clause 23.75. The implications of this proposal are wide reaching - for traffic load on Leighton Buzzard road and through the AONB in Potten End and the Chilterns. These roads and connections are currently inadequate to support the inevitable diversion of (HGV and private) traffic from Berkhamsted through Potten End and via this "new corridor," in preference to the longer and congested A41 - A414-M1 links from Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring.</p>

The loss of hospital services from a growing local population is regrettable - and places further strain on Dacorum residents to travel (time) and to pay for parking in Watford. Watford capacity is already stretched.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6935

**Person ID** 1265063

**Full Name** Richard Scott

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6988

**Person ID** 1265081

**Full Name** Caitlin Neale

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7008
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Increased traffic on the A41/Kings Langley with the chances of serious improvement to the A41/M25 junction remote in the near future. Due to expansions in Tring, Berkhamsted and further afield, peak trains will be full by the time they reach Hemel.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7061
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7138
<b>Person ID</b>	1265074
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Wilson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plan incorporates the development of a huge area of the upper Gade Valley. This is wrong and I am against it. The valley has been recognised for its outstanding natural beauty, and any development would destroy it for ever.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7208
<b>Person ID</b>	1265129
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Foxwell-Moss
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Clearly, prioritising building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development in the Hemel Garden Communities allocation is unjustifiable. It goes against NPPF strategy.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7300
<b>Person ID</b>	358532
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Gillian Culham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	P211 – Hemel Hempstead Town Centre and health and wellbeing page: EPR28 36 23.80. Re-configuration of the hospital site is much sort after – not to rely on Watford alone, it's too far for emergencies, especially with all the new construction in thus part of Hertfordshire, all the extra communities perhaps we can still get a NEW HOSPITAL, in the HUNTON BRIDGE area – more choice of roadways to reach this place.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7324
<b>Person ID</b>	1265325
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE GILDEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Having read the local plan I am dismayed at the amount of housing being planned for Hemel Hempstead. This is far in excess of the amount needed for the residents of Hemel and is just encouraging incomers. I also think it is scandalous to build on Greenbelt land (or what was once Greenbelt land that has been reclassified). The area around Grovehill should not be built on & The Crown Estates should not be allowed to compulsory purchase land off the landowners. With this excessive amount of planned housing little thought seems to have gone into medical care- the area needs a new hospital and even if Watford is redeveloped it will not meet the needs of the area. I have very little faith in this planning process both from a National and Local level and I really do not think the interests of Hemel Hempstead residents are being met by this plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7394
<b>Person ID</b>	1265375
<b>Full Name</b>	LANYING BURLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to object to the proposed development. I am very concerned about the development plan that has been published and the impact it would have on the parish of Great Gaddesden.  I appreciate that things should continue in lockdown but for something as important and as significant as this should be done when people have the freedom to engage and discuss this issue which will adversely affect so many people. A proposal to increase housing in the borough by 25% on 2000 acres of Green Belt, countryside and urban green space is a major plan which needs to be fully considered by everyone involved . I hope that this is not being pushed through at a time when people cannot easily take a stand or get together to voice their opinions.

The proposed development covers almost 18% of the parish and reaches right to the border of the (Area of Natural Beauty) AONB demarcation line. The increase of sound and light pollution will significantly damage the natural beauty of the AONB. Chiltern's area of outstanding natural beauty should not be made vulnerable to this so called 'vision'.

The area is already suffering badly from the creeping urbanisation as littering and fly tipping and traffic have become major problems. Increasing the number of housing, people and traffic will only make the situation worse. The roads and country lanes are not fit to cope with increased traffic and will only lead to more congestion and more accidents on the narrower lanes where there are many cyclists and walkers.

I appreciate that developers are pushing hard but we need to push back even harder and not permit this plan.

We do not need all this housing. I appreciate that Dacorum has fought hard to have the original number lowered and had expected the original number of 922 to be reduced when the algorithm was cancelled but it has actually been increased by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government to an even more unreasonable figure despite clear evidence that the need is actually likely to be substantially lower.

It is vital that the fight to correct this continues and secures a permanent resolution to help protect this parish and this county from irrevocable harm.

The plan talks about 'developing the transport proposals' but currently the area that this plan encompasses does not have any existing infrastructure and can only result in more road traffic on already overcrowded roads. The proposed link road with Junction 8 will compound the environmental issues and cause significant further environmental and real harm to the surroundings.

I strongly object to the proposals and urge Dacorum to continue to resist inappropriate targets, to continue to fight for fairer ones and make clear the problems and issues which this plan will create.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7460

**Person ID** 1264102

**Full Name** Jacqueline Sawyer

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

I wish to object to your proposed Dacorum development plan.

- 1 Green belt should remain in place.

**Green Belt Land: A definition**

Green belts are a buffer between towns, and between town and countryside. The green belt designation is a planning tool and the aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;

- 1 Current Infrastructure will simply not support the additional homes.

Not enough school places within neighbourhood vicinities.

Not sufficient medical services ie Access to GP s, Dentist, &

Limited local hospital facilities.

- 1 Hopelessly inadequate road network. Cycle ways are not the answer, residents commute. The designated industrial area ( Maylands Avenue) already part residential.

- 1 Local jobs, simply not enough to support such a influx of people.

- 1 No regard for additional leisure facilities, most current provision over subscribed.

This plan has no regard for the quality of life living in Hemel Hempstead. Just an ill conceived plan, a wholly inadequate strategy.

I am not against some additional residential housing, but the scale of the development you are proposing is astounding.

Every resident of the borough you represent will be negatively affected in some way, and sadly if agreed we will loose so much and gain so little.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7539

**Person ID** 1265590

**Full Name** Ms Hazel Ellis

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have just been looking at your proposals, and frankly it makes me want to move from the town I have lived in all my life. How can we possibly need this many houses? How is it acceptable to build on Green Belt land EVER? The land above Piccotts End is one of the few areas left as a "green lung" just outside the town.</p> <p>Why do we need the town centre to be crammed full of houses and flats with little or no parking provision? I note you are even proposing building on an existing car park! We have seen the results of over-development in the Nash Mills and Apsley areas with regards to parking issues. This will make the entire town unnavigable for motorists.</p> <p>The proposals all around the Box Moor Trust land and Two Waters area are intrusive and excessive. Again, this is one of the few places in the town centre that is natural and green.</p> <p>And finally, how can it possibly be acceptable to build this many new houses when there is NO HOSPITAL for our town? I am completely exasperated.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7613
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Comments to Public Consultation on Dacorum Local Plan from Redbourn Parish Council:</p> <p>In respect of the Hemel Garden Communities project, the draft Dacorum Local Plan seems to be assuming that extensive development on Greenbelt land in the Redbourn Ward of St Albans District, is a 'done deal' when, in fact, St Albans District Council is starting afresh with a new draft Local Plan and development sites have yet to be decided. Accordingly,</p>

such references to development in St Albans District should be removed from the draft Dacorum Plan. In any case, Redbourn Parish Council objects to any extension into the Parish's Greenbelt. Loss of Greenbelt between Hemel Hempstead and Redbourn Village would see urban sprawl and a significant narrowing of the gap between the two settlements contrary to the purposes of the Greenbelt as outlined in the NPPF. In addition, extensive development on Greenbelt in the area would cause serious damage to the local environment and ecology at a time when we have a climate change emergency. It should also be noted that much of the land to the east and north east of Hemel is high quality farm land (grade 2), and should be protected as such.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7621

**Person ID** 1207710

**Full Name** Penny Bennetts

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** I notice "we plan to uplift densities of new homes ..." which I take to mean people will be living in tiny homes which I oppose. It sounds like a slum-to-be. I think it is better to build well than squeeze people into residential boxes. If you lower the number of homes needed, this would be possible. I do not like the large development to the north of Hemel Hempstead in particular.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7762

**Person ID** 1265794

**Full Name** RICHARD EVANS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Hemel Hempstead, and I am writing to give feedback on the Dacorum Local Plan.</p> <p>I am worried that the proposal to build more than 900 homes per year in Dacorum will have a very negative effect on our borough, seriously diminishing it as a place to live. The green space around Hemel is the thing that makes it special, and I worry that if we lose more green space to housing then it will have a negative effect on the area. It also makes it likely that we will have more buildings of over four storeys and, particularly around the moor, this will make the area much less attractive. The moor is a huge asset to our town and we should be protecting it at all costs, including from having more homes there that will make it feel less rural and lead to more traffic.</p> <p>This does not feel like a sensible time to be determining future housing need. We have already seen people leave the UK as the result of Covid, and it is likely that Brexit will significantly reduce net immigration from EU countries (and Dacorum's proximity to London means it will be disproportionately affected by this). Also, the rise of home working as a result of Covid is likely to have a long-term impact on working habits, which could in turn make Hemel's easy access to London less of a draw to the town, with people choosing to live in towns with less easy access to London because they may only be going into London a couple of times a week. Given the high level of uncertainty about future housing need, it is absolutely the wrong time to be planning a large expansion of home building. I have real fears that we will end up losing our green space and increasing the number of tall building to build homes that sit vacant because there aren't the people who want to live in them.</p> <p>I urge the council to reject the plan, or at least scale the level of planned housing expansion back significantly.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7776
<b>Person ID</b>	1265892
<b>Full Name</b>	Madeleine Woodstock
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are Dacorum residents in Boxmoor and very concerned by the lack of consultation on this plan. The green belt land is one of the reasons we have chosen to buy a house in this area and overdeveloping our countryside strips this part of town of what makes it so special
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7778
<b>Person ID</b>	1265893
<b>Full Name</b>	James Moodie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are Dacorum residents in Boxmoor and very concerned by the lack of consultation on this plan. The green belt land is one of the reasons we have chosen to buy a house in this area and overdeveloping our countryside strips this part of town of what makes it so special.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7844
<b>Person ID</b>	1265143
<b>Full Name</b>	Abigail Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I do not agree with the proposals in the Dacorum Local Plan 2020 to 2038 for the following reasons:</p> <p>Too many homes are proposed. This plan should be about making Hemel be a nicer place to live, not about how to meet government building targets. Hemel is a great place to live but increasing the population density would make this a worse place to live as there would be too many people, the area of the town would be too vast and we would lose the countryside feel that made us want to move here in the first place. I don't think that numbers that have been proposed are correct and I think that we should be using the most recent data from ONS to calculate the number of homes needed.</p> <p>I do not want greenbelt land to be built upon as this is what makes Hemel a lovely place to live and we are so lucky to be surrounded by beautiful countryside. I also do not want the area of the town to increase as it already feels that we cover a large area. I do not want Hemel to merge with Bourne End or will be used and it will then be gone forever. I do not want this land released to developers as I do not trust that the right decisions on what homes are built will be the right. To release greenbelt land should only ever be done in exceptional circumstances and these are not exceptional circumstances. I have two young children that love being outside and love the green space and I want this to be kept safe for them as adults and also for their children.</p> <p>To fit in this number of homes, many tall buildings will be built and this will make Hemel feel like a city rather than a rural town. I do not want to see any buildings above 6 storeys in Hemel. I think that people are moving out of London because they realise that they want gardens and green space. A friend in the development business has told me that homes without outside space are not a good investment and are not popular with buyers. I do not think that flats are suitable for people with young families and that they should have houses with gardens. I don't like looking up from the moor and seeing the Kodak building as it ruins the skyline so I definitely don't want anymore tall buildings. I feel that the ones that have been built on the old civic centre site feel very imposing and claustrophobic and I would hate that feeling to be elsewhere in Hemel.</p> <p>There are 7000 people on the housing list in Dacorum but in this plan, only 70 of the homes proposed per year are expected to be social housing. This is nowhere near the estimated 315 homes that we need per year.</p> <p>I am glad that Dacorum Council have declared a climate emergency and have ambitions to address environmental issues but I don't feel they are taking this seriously as they are then saying that they are going to build all these new homes. This amount of building will generate vast amounts of CO2 through all the building materials and machinery used but will also make matters worse by removing green space and so take away the means of absorbing CO2. I'm also concerned that we will have more pollution as more people equals more cars, despite whatever promises of better transport are made by the council. The larger in geographical size the town gets, the more people will be dependent on getting into their car to get to shops, the train station or drive themselves or their children to clubs.</p>



I am concerned that within the timescale of this plan there will be water shortages as we are already close to our limit and the extra population will prove too much for our water supply. I am not aware of any plans to address this from the council or the water companies. This is a big issue and it is worrying that this is not being addressed.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7861

**Person ID** 1265018

**Full Name** Kevin Sears

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

To whom it may concern,

I believe that the number of new homes included in the local plan is too just too many. It will have a detrimental effect on the local area.

One of the best things about Hemel is it's green space and rural feel. After all it is a town, not a city, and I do not want it to turn into an overcrowded area full of high rise buildings and too many properties which is what is proposed in the Plan.

The greenbelt land is hugely important for me and my children and should not be released unless for exceptional reasons. Building too many properties, which will not benefit more than a fraction of those requiring social housing, is simply not an exceptional reason.

Removing green space whilst generating harmful CO2 is not environmentally responsible behaviour and completely goes against the environmental statements Dacorum Council have made regarding the Climate emergency in the past. Furthermore additional homes brings additional cars and further impact on the environment.

There is no information as to how the infrastructure will cope with the additional number of homes proposed. They have closed our local hospital and how will utilities fulfill this many new houses? How will schools, doctors and other services cope?

I live in Boxmoor with my family and am lucky to enjoy beautiful views of the Moors, river and Canal from my house. Every day my family enjoys our immediate green surroundings- it is so important for our physical and mental wellbeing to have these green spaces around us and not more dwellings. We have a huge array of wildlife in Boxmoor, including Kingfishers and newly introduced watervoles. This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and should be maintained without hesitation, not destroyed which is what will happen if this Local Plan is approved.

Please acknowledge this email and confirm my response has been received.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7879

**Person ID** 1265981

**Full Name** Elaine Bidwell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** I wish to express my concern at the proposed building of new homes within Hemel Hempstead and surrounding areas, particularly in relation to building on Green Belt land and other green spaces.

If lockdown has shown us one thing it is the importance of green space during difficult times. Being able to walk out of your front door and see and explore open areas of greenery, harbouring nature, is so important for every person's health and wellbeing. For this reason alone, although there are plenty more, new homes should not be built on green spaces. Even being able to look out of the window and see some green is so important. If you go ahead with these proposals we will all be looking out on a sea of concrete.

I live in Grovehill so of particular worry to me is Marchmont Fields. To build houses in this area would increase the neighbourhood of Grovehill to a ridiculous size, putting pressure on local roads, shops, schools, doctors, dentists and public transport. The Link Road currently is a very busy main road, which if you have a housing estate half way down it, with a mini roundabout, would cause serious congestion. The other concern on this site is having a traveller's site. We are all familiar with the Cherry Tree Lane site and the problems of anti social behaviour throughout the town which this site brings. To locate another site in Hemel Hempstead would be a big mistake and totally against residents' wishes.

The other reasons why green space shouldn't be built on are as follows:

Do we really need all these extra homes? The way I see it, nobody born and bred in Hemel Hempstead is going to be able to afford them, however affordable you try and make them. Most of them will be snapped up by people from other areas or landlords renting them out to young professionals. There are already a mountain of new apartments being built both in the town centre and the industrial area, along with offices being turned into apartments. Surely wait and see if they get filled before thinking about building more. At least these apartments are being built on brownfield sites and are not impacting on or damaging the environment.

How can we accommodate more homes within Hemel Hempstead when we do not have a fully functioning hospital? Hemel Hospital has consistently been downgraded and would not be suitable to cater for the lives of more residents, when there is already a struggle to get people to Watford now in an emergency.

The roads around Hemel are congested enough. We're bang in the middle of the two busiest motorways, the M1 and M25. More homes mean more people, which in turn means more cars and more pollution. Pollution that could be lessened with the keeping of trees and open spaces, but that's what you're going to take away from us. The normal A and B roads are already suffering under the weight of current traffic, with potholes and floods causing road closures.

Where will the wildlife go that resides in these green spaces. We as humans are taking over every habitat and driving other species out to the point where all that will exist are humans in a concrete jungle. The news is full of damage to the environment, being green, planting more trees, reducing our carbon footprint, how we must live in harmony with nature, and yet you are all just going against what we need to do to ensure the planet keeps going for future generations.

The countryside is currently on our doorstep and that's where it should stay. If you build new homes on all our green spaces, the only way we will be able to walk in nature will be to get in the car and drive out to it. That totally defeats the object of being environmentally friendly and is not something that everyone will be able or have the means to do.

Please let's keep the green spaces for the majority, not the few, and most importantly keep it local.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7913

**Person ID** 1265993

**Full Name** SHEENA BULLOCK

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am dismayed by the number of proposed properties to be built in Hemel and surrounding areas I feel we do not have the required infrastructure in place to support this massive increase in population. There is no local hospital our local DGH has struggled to cope for years and this recent pandemic has demonstrated that despite valiant efforts it has not coped with demands of increased capacity. Residents of Hemel struggle to find a local GP and it's impossible to find an NHS dentist in the area.</p> <p>Dacorum council and local housing groups currently takes tenants from London and houses them in social housing in this area I question this policy when we are told so many local people are waiting to be housed and feel this invalidates the reason stated regarding people waiting for social housing The amount of building will impact on the local community and environment. Areas of green belt and recreational areas will be lost for ever. Areas where my parents and generations before them will be lost to our children. In a time when we are trying to encourage our younger generation to enjoy there natural surroundings flora and fauna this is abhorrent . We will be destroying the very essence of our town with this massive population increase I look forward to your response</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8024
<b>Person ID</b>	1266030
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON RANCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too many houses are being planned. No hospital. Flooding as not enough drainage. Not enough jobs, schools, parking. Overcrowded town
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8124
<b>Person ID</b>	1266078
<b>Full Name</b>	Emily Wright
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am against the building on the greenbelt. The number of houses is far too high. I live opposite the Moor and I am very concerned about the spoiling of such a beautiful view and the green space we all hugely benefit from here. It will severely decrease the attraction of hemel and the beauty of it too. We should be adding more green spaces, not taking away.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8190
<b>Person ID</b>	1207825
<b>Full Name</b>	Claire Hobson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

I am responding to the consultation on behalf of myself and the X adults who live with me.

I gave up trying to use the portal as it was impossible to work through all the documentation to answer the questions - why wasn't a simple questionnaire set up, separate from the documentation? This is one of the worst examples of a system set up for the benefit of the people receiving and collating responses rather than making it easy for citizens to reply. This is an unacceptable barrier to responding.

I have lived in Boxmoor for over 23 years, I went to senior school in Warners End and until the pandemic commuted to London daily. I brought up my family here and have loved being close to the town centre, the canal and plenty of green space that sets Hemel aside from many post war developments.

My response lacks detail as there is far too much information to go through on top of an office job, caring for an elderly mother with dementia who has been unable to attend her day centre since April last year, two close relatives suffering from recent and historic trauma, running a small local business that has been busier due to more people working from home during the pandemic, and my role as a local councillor. The consultation is not very accessible or easy to digest on a screen, even for me an IT literate person who has a professional office set up at home, with a large screen/keyboard/mouse etc. For those who only have a tablet or phone it is impossible to engage in any meaningful way with the consultation. I apologise in advance for any typos - I am exhausted from all the extra work I have had to do in the pandemic due to public services being closed for a year and more people in the house and community to look after.

I am educated to MSc level, a formal Senior Civil Servant, and am computer literate - for the avoidance of doubt when reviewing my complaints about how hard you have made it to reply and engage with the process for the citizens of Dacorum.

I urge councillors and officers to take a step back and put themselves in the shoes of residents when designing huge and life-changing consultations. This has not put the council in a good light. Some local councillors have taken to social media to publicise the consultation but there was very little from the council. This consultation should have been postponed or extended to beyond lockdowns and school closures to enable a full and open review and engagement with the whole community.

We support the responses of OneVoice, Chiltern Society and the Liberal Democrat Group, among others, so I will not seek to duplicate their detailed points here, but focus on the main points of concern for a long time resident of Boxmoor, a jewel in Hemel's crown.

Greenfield/greenbelt

The green belt should be protected at all costs, and brownfield sites prioritised over any permanent destruction of greenbelt land. The council has said in public council meetings that they will protect greenbelt to the death but this is not what the consultation says and this is what has enraged so many residents.

Housing requirement and council tactics (Q1)

Too many houses, too few affordable homes.

It is absolutely clear that the number of houses supposedly held to our temples is far far too many on any rationale and evidence-based up to date analysis. The plan is woefully short on ensuring a large proportion of social/affordable housing, which is what residents of Dacorum need. The council has failed its citizens by refusing to face up to the Government and push back on the numbers. To throw the pass to the community in the middle of a pandemic with a consultation that proposes an eye-watering and irrevocable destruction of greenbelt and increase in town sizes of Berkhamsted and Tring is incomprehensible. This is an incredibly risky strategy in the middle of a pandemic when you will not have reached a significant proportion of the community die to pandemic restrictions. There are still more people in Dacorum who don't know about the consultation or its life-changing implications than there are who do know. And of those who do know, how many of them will have the time or energy to reply substantively? Please, on behalf of your residents, fight back at the government figures and listen to us. To ignore any criticism as politically motivated blinds you to listening to what we have to say *as people who live here and will live here, hopefully alongside the next generation, for the rest of our lives - decades* is rude at best and incredibly insulting and not in the interests of what's best for Dacorum at worst. Other councils have fought back, why didn't we? Why didn't you agree the tactics with the residents whose lives will be affected by the new Local Plan?

The evidence base for the number of houses needed in Dacorum should be the 2014 ONS numbers and not 2018.

#### London Road development

4 storeys max at the station.

Another case of the Council not appearing to listen...in the most recent consultation on the station development, the overwhelming response from residents was to limit any development to 4 storeys to protect the local scenery, including overlooking the ancient grazing land of Boxmoor Trust and the view of Roughdown common and the fields beyond from resident in the heart of Boxmoor village. Why does the current plan say '8 storeys or more'??? What is the point of consultation?

It is clear to anyone who lives in the immediate area or who travels along London Road to and from town and Apsley or the A41 that height is a given at the Plough roundabout and at the scarred land and buildings next to Aldi at the A41 Junction.

There is scope to develop the ugly brownfield sites along London road opposite the moor, eg around the old gas works and near the trainline between the A41 and the roundabout at Roughdown road.

The area between Roughdown Road and the station roundabout must remain low rise to protect the street scene as Hemel moves into more green land towards Box Lane. I will fight any proposal to have higher than 4 storeys along this stretch of road and at the station.

#### Who are the new homes for?

The original proposals for the station development showed apartments that were clearly for commuters, which would be certain to pull people from London into the areas and with inadequate numbers of affordable properties, would not help local people looking to get onto the property ladder.

#### Commercial/retail at the station

Lockdown has impacted local businesses heavily and the council should be very cautious about approving retail space at the station that could take business away from Boxmoor village centre or town centre, the latter having taken a huge hit from multiple lockdowns. With the town walkable for the majority of people who would live in starter apartments like those proposed for the station development and regular bus services to town, there is limited rationale to have a supermarket or too many restaurant or food businesses at the station location.

#### Sustainability/climate change

There is nothing in this plan to reassure me that we would have sufficient water to provide for all of the new homes, nor that the council is acting NOW on the climate emergency they declared. An emergency means taking action immediately and we have seen far too little action and too few ideas in this plan, contradicted by the destruction of the greenbelt etc. The council has also agreed to protect the area's unique chalk streams which are essential to maintaining a balanced ecology. These are at risk now and adding too many more houses will impact them further.

The planned housing should be carbon neutral at worst and negative at best. The plan is woefully unambitious on this.

#### Infrastructure

The infrastructure plan lacks detail on how the roads and cycle lanes will be built/improved and designed to reduce car use. The council needs to be far more proactive, imaginative and positive about designing for a low carbon future and helping residents live in uncongested places.

#### In summary

There is insufficient evidence of housing need to support the level of development (Q8). Full exploitation of brownfield sites for the Local Plan is not fully evidenced. So the Plan fails to meet Section 137 of the NPPF, which specifies the exceptional circumstances that need to exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries.

PLEASE LISTEN TO US - use the citizen's panel and have one for each area in the plan so we can co-design housing, infrastructure and space together. No one knows the area and its needs better than the people who live here.

There are so many good people who work for the council and have worked so very hard on this plan but this proposal is cloth-eared, unambitious and risks ruining the lives and the enjoyment of Hemel and Dacourm's green spaces forever.

#### **Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
--------------	--

<b>ID</b>	EGS8261
-----------	---------

<b>Person ID</b>	1264136
------------------	---------

<b>Full Name</b>	Monica Mills
------------------	--------------

#### **Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This huge amount of development makes me very sad! I strongly object!!!</p> <p>Hemel is growing too fast and losing its identity. We do not have the infrastructure to cope with all this development.</p> <p>The amount of flats in the town centre is ludicrous! So many people all crammed together and as if that is not bad enough now you want to build on our beautiful green belt land!</p> <p>This is the lung for the towns. Hemel will soon be a city.</p> <p>No proper hospital and our Pavillion never replaced.</p> <p>Shame on you!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8332
<b>Person ID</b>	1266191
<b>Full Name</b>	Mary Arnott-Gee
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I oppose the plans as Hemel already has a large population and this endangers the green belt land that was part of the original planning for new towns. It seems to me to be unacceptable to build so many houses in this area when the infrastructure is already strained.</p> <p>Yet again, it seems Hemel is the 'poor relation' and the interests of local residents are not being protected.</p> <p>Please register this mail as reflecting my objections/concerns - not least about the poor consultative process.</p> <p>I have lived in Hemel for the last 60 years and am horrified at these latest plans, which I feel are detrimental to the area.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8340
<b>Person ID</b>	1266200
<b>Full Name</b>	ROGER HANDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Section 2.10 :- The loss of Debenhams will leave a large empty building – what are the plans to find a business to fill this space. How will leaving the EU affect trade in the town?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8354
<b>Person ID</b>	211117
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Heylin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Section 2.10 :- The loss of Debenhams will leave a large empty building – what are the plans to find a business to fill this space. How will leaving the EU affect trade in the town?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8369
<b>Person ID</b>	1266205
<b>Full Name</b>	DI HAMMOND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Section 2.10 :- The loss of Debenhams will leave a large empty building – what are the plans to find a business to fill this space. How will leaving the EU affect trade in the town?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8391
<b>Person ID</b>	1266218
<b>Full Name</b>	KAREN DU PLESSIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Shearwater Road (Apsley, Hemel Hempstead), I am also really concerned to see the high levels of additional sites earmarked for provision of further dwellings along London Road/ Two Waters. As it is there is terrible congestion during peak hours along London Road and Two Waters. That is before you factor in the final developments in the Bovis/ Aspen Park development, the Two Waters apartment block currently being developed, the Apartments next to St Mary's and opposite the station adding even a higher number of vehicles to the existing state of affairs. Every dwelling adds at least 1-2 cars to the local roads further worsening the traffic and pollution along London Road. What will the plans be to provide additional infrastructure, services and school spaces for so many additional families? This does not seem to be sustainable.</p> <p>Apsley high street's retail offering (between two waters junction and the Dunelm site) is not attractive nor does it have shops that really service the local area, given the poor state of the properties along London road and lack of parking. This further adds to the traffic to travel to Berkhamsted, Kings Langley or Hemel High Street. Apsley's high street should be targeted for redevelopment including provision of parking e.g. the site designated as Growth Area HH14: 233 London Road could be used to provide the necessary parking to improve footfall to these shops to attract better stores.</p> <p>Reading the proposal, I understand that the Council is under pressure to plan for the development of a large number of additional homes by the government. However, these targets were handed out before the full impact of Brexit and the pandemic are known. A large number of people have or will be losing their jobs. In addition, there is likely to be a lot less people making the daily commute into London every day. I think that it is highly unlikely that life will return to exactly as it was in February 2020. Should the Council and the Government not be delaying the planning period to better understand how the pandemic and Brexit have changed society and daily life, as a lot of the consultation and prep work was carried out quite a while ago.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8423
<b>Person ID</b>	1266238
<b>Full Name</b>	KATH DELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There are too many flats being built in Hemel. The numbers are too high and are spoiling our lovely little town
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8453
<b>Person ID</b>	1266279
<b>Full Name</b>	MATTHEW HADFIELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed amount of new housing, 922 per year totalling 16596 in 18 years is a ridiculous amount, especially when majority is built on green belt land which is of natural beauty.</p> <p>This number of houses would have to be of a high-rise development to make the numbers work, especially in the town centre and the Hemel train station, this in turn would ruin all the views over the Felden and adjoining country side, this would have a detrimental effect for the local community, which would be destroyed forever.</p> <p>The calculation seems to be based on an outdated model and should be updated especially due to the long-lasting changes that Covid19 has bought on, mainly based on the amount of people that will be remote working or reduced days in the office, lots of companies are reducing their office capacity. This also means people don't need to live in such close commuting distance of London.</p> <p>Irrelevant of covid the proposed plan doesn't address the need for affordable housing, putting up a large number of flats does not help local families which this plan is to address, this will bring more people to the area out of London therefore not resolving the issue but adding to it.</p> <p>One of my main concerns of all this building is the effect on the water level, as you know , or should know, we already issues with flooding in and around the Moors around the train station with it being the lowest point.</p> <p>To sum up I think the numbers are based on outdated model that needs to be revisited before irreversible damage is done to a beautiful rural town.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8463
<b>Person ID</b>	1266291
<b>Full Name</b>	NICOLE DUNBAR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Boxmoor trust provides a unique feel to the village and building properties that are higher than 4 stories around the moor would damage the natural habitat, provide a sense of closed area and intact would push people away in the village. I appreciate in some areas the need for growth but with population growing, Boxmoor is an area that should absolutely not be touched.</p> <p>It would create a damaging feel and in-fact, we feel it would create more disruption in terms of littering, noise, and, poverty rather than leaving it a desired area to travel too. Our planet matters and I know the residents in the village would very much have the same opinion. If the green goes, the animals will be affected and you're also affecting climate change.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8613
<b>Person ID</b>	1264795
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Stanley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Some feedback to say that I found portal cumbersome to use, but more importantly that the target numbers appear to be far too high and would make Hemel Hempstead, in particular, more crowded thus losing a lot of the rural appeal.</p> <p>Near Hemel train station there are proposals for up to 8 story dwellings which would be far too high and ruin fantastic outlook and aspect of Boxmoor. Density of housing proposal is too high.</p> <p>I worry that already busy traffic would increase and crime might increase towards that more associated with urban areas.</p> <p>Extra open spaces and sports fields facilities would not be enough for higher population.</p> <p>I believe there should be serious push back against the overall high building targets which I do not believe are justified.</p> <p>I have lived in Hemel most of my life and do not want it to keep growing in proposed unsustainable way, which I think would reduce quality of life for my young family and other existing residents.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8683
<b>Person ID</b>	1266684
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Orchard-Lisle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 The proposed areas for new homes will generate additional traffic into the already over congested Maylands Industrial area and to the M1</p> <p>2 It would be better to designate land for employment uses in locations (indecipherable word) from Maylands and perhaps using the A41 as its main access</p> <p>3 The National Trust Ashridge Estate is a splendid area for all to enjoy; however its popularity is choking its access and undermining its attraction. Therefore new housing development should have amenity land within easy reach that does not involve the use of roads (indecipherable word) Ashridge for access.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8703
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Transport</u>. The county council welcomes the inclusion of this section, although it is considered that HCC would also require discussion/confidence in any mechanisms for funding via CIL.</p> <p><b>Supporting Growth in the Delivery Strategies Paragraph 23.4</b></p> <p><u>Transport</u>. Transport infrastructure is likely to be required at and by identifiable points of development, these may be known at a high level at the start of the planned HCC monitors and forecasts transport impacts, and as development areas progresses and other factors influence travel behaviours in the wider population, critical infrastructure trigger points are likely to become known. Whilst these may not be identifiable at the time of submitting a plan, policy to support required infrastructure funding at the required time will be required. This is critical for transport infrastructure as forward funding may be required and this is not a simple fit with CIL</p>



## Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

Transport. The county council would like to see more emphasis placed on the importance of transport infrastructure that will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport within and between Hemel Garden Due to the mixture of land uses proposed within Hemel Garden Communities (with residential and employment land uses within close proximity to each other) there is potential for a significant modal shift away from private car use towards sustainable modes of transport, and this needs to be highlighted within the text of these two sections.

### Paragraph 23.47

Transport. The 60% modal shift will be for all active and sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport and the text in this paragraph needs to be changed to reflect this. The 60% should be seen as an absolute value of all journeys to and from the garden communities should be made by sustainable

### Paragraph 23.48

Transport. It should be noted that a network of MMTIs (of differing scales) are expected across Hemel Hempstead, not just Maylands and the Hemel Garden Communities development area. Paragraph 23.48, along with the following bullet points within it should be amended as follows:

*The HGC Transport Plan will provide further information on the above. The HGC programme will be focussed on prioritising active and sustainable travel to provide options for wider sustainable connectivity via train stations, ~~and~~ priority bus routes ~~such as the~~ and ultimately the Mass Rapid Transit Route through the town, in line with the ~~along the A414 corridor and~~ with long term aspirations to deliver significant modal share targets across the town. In addition, four strategic movement corridors will be identified across the town with a series of interventions to support growth and transformation. The interventions will include the following:*

- *significant improvements to Junction 8 of the M1 and the A414/Green Lanes (Breakspear) junction;*
- *Safeguarded land that will provide a network of MMTIs with related services and facilities serving Maylands and HGC;*
- *safeguarded land for a potential Mass Rapid Transit Corridor ~~along the A414;~~*
- *a network of pedestrian and cycle routes promoting connectivity across Hemel Hempstead and to nearby*

Children's Services. A total of 11,125 dwellings are proposed across Hemel Hempstead in the emerging plan (including 4,000 dwellings proposed in North Hemel-Phase 2 beyond the plan period and 200 dwellings within the Grovehill Neighbourhood Plan allocation) and along with windfall and other commitments, these amount to approximately 3,500 dwellings. When taking this into account, the LPA would need to plan to accommodate a potential additional child yield of 27 forms of entry (27fe).

In order to provide sufficient education infrastructure to mitigate the level of pupil yield that may arise from these developments, a total of eleven new primary school allocations are sought and three new secondary school

### Paragraph 23.51

Children's Services. The level of primary school provision that is stated within this paragraph for North Hemel Hempstead is incorrect, along with their intended size. Development proposed within the North Hemel Hempstead allocations that

form part of the wider 'Hemel Garden Communities' amounts to an increase of 5,550 dwellings (1,550 dwellings within the plan period in phase 1 and 4,000 dwellings beyond the plan period in phase 2). This amounts to a potential additional child yield of just under 14fe, when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil Sites for five new 2.92ha primary school sites are sought (amounting to 15fe) and the text within this paragraph should be changed to reflect this.

With regard to secondary school provision, it should be noted that there is currently no guarantee that a new secondary school site will be delivered in East Hemel Hempstead (which falls within St Albans City & District) that will meet the needs of the DBC as the LPA. This should be recognised as a strategic cross boundary issue.

*The text also needs to be made clear that the potential secondary school allocation is in addition to the one that has been identified as potentially suitable site on the edge of the borough (within St Albans City & District) in the Secondary School Site Search appraisal for South East Hemel Hempstead. This should also be recognised as a strategic cross boundary issue between the county council, St Albans City & District and Dacorum Borough Council.*

**Paragraph 23.56**

Minerals & Waste Planning. It should be noted that the current Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) at Hemel Hempstead is too small to adequately deal with the high level of demand placed on it and that it is not financially viable to expand this centre. The county council therefore supports its relocation (please refer to comments that have been made in relation to the supporting text under Growth Area HH01: North Hemel Phase 1).

**Paragraph 23.67**

Transport. It is considered that this paragraph appears to confuse what the proposed developments within Hemel Hempstead will deliver and what is envisaged in the Hemel Sustainable Transport Plan and HCC's A414 Strategy/Mass Rapid Transit proposals. It is not currently known whether the proposed allocations within Hemel Hempstead will be able to all of the above, in its entirety. These instead may contribute to, and some may have to be delivered via other means. It should be noted that details of interventions are also not confirmed, as Stage 2 of the Sustainable Transport Plan has yet to commence and the Mass Rapid Transport (MRT) proposal is ongoing.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8773
<b>Person ID</b>	1266777
<b>Full Name</b>	CATHERINE CRAWLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please be advised that I have just briefly looked at the development plans for Hemel Hempstead and I am in objection to so many proposals for dwellings.</p> <p>It's all very well building thousands of new homes but we need the infrastructure to support them i.e. schools, a proper hospital, doctors surgeries, dentists, libraries, football and other sports pitches to name a few.</p> <p>The other issue with bringing so many people into the town is the number of cars it will also attract. We just don't have the infrastructure to support thousands and thousands more cars. The roads are already under strain and parking is a real issue.</p> <p>I do appreciate that the council have done a great job on the water gardens and riverside and Hemel Hempstead is a good place to live but let's keep it that way by not being too ambitious with plans for so many new dwellings.</p> <p>I believe that there will be several offices which will no longer be required and my proposal would be to look at these and set about converting them to apartments similar to Kodak house rather than building on green spaces.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8782
<b>Person ID</b>	1266782
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS & MR RELF
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

I am aware of the proposed local plans for new houses in Dacorum and I would like to comments on the plans, in particular those relating to Hemel Hempstead. I am very concerned with the proposal to build so many houses so quickly and the impact this would have on the community, our countryside and environment. It would change Hemel completely from a rural town to a city and this would be wrong considering there is a need to keep and maintained more green spaces for everyone's wellbeing, mental health especially following the Covid pandemic and not forgetting for wildlife to thrive and to reduce carbon emission. A climate emergency was declared in Dacorum so the number of houses in the plan goes against the environmental ambitions. More houses and a loss of green spaces completely go against reducing CO2 emissions. This would also create more traffic. And water usage would also be an issue.

I am also very disappointed to see that buildings of 8 storeys high are proposed at Hemel train station. How does this proposal fit with the existing houses in the surrounding area and the Boxmoor Trust green space which is an asset to the town and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty? In addition, the recent consultation about buildings at the station indicated that residents felt that a maximum of 4 storeys high should be the very maximum. There are few stations where you can walk through a field of horses, sheep or cows depending on the season to get to the station. The new station's development should therefore not over-power the surroundings and permanently put an end to the street scene of the area around the station.

Any shops at the train station should only be given to local businesses/Hemel/Dacorum residents and not big chains to protect Hemel's own businesses and for its community to thrive. It should also aim to be an extension of existing local businesses rather than small chain stores. We don't want more of Starbucks, Tesco's or similar shops to be at the station. The current ONS projections is that 355 new homes are needed per year in the borough in the next 10 years and not 922 when calculated using out of date data. The best data available must be used or we run the risk of irreversible release of green belt to housing that would damage our countryside and environment. We don't want to lose land to developers and end up with Hemel-Bourne End merging with Berkhamsted. The greenbelt land is what will continue to make Hemel a lovely place to live. We will never be able to get it back if it is lost to housing.

Only houses that are needed with a minimum of 35-40% affordable ones should be built. Priority should be given to address the current needs for affordable houses and home those on the current housing list first. There shouldn't be more new houses on land that developers can maximise on for their own profits with no or limited benefits or ROI for the local community.

The plan will also need to be reviewed to take into account the impact of Covid-19 on people's life especially with less people expected to commute when back to the new normal. This is especially important as the plan is affected by London's need for housing. If less people need to commute to London then it is anticipated that a significant portion of London office spaces will be converted into housing which will reduce the need for new homes to be built not only in London but also around London therefore in Dacorum.

In addition following the Brexit vote in 2016, the number of EU workers in London has already reduced significantly, therefore reducing the London population and need for housing.

**Included files**

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8819
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>Here are our initial thoughts on the Delivery Strategy -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can the loss of a significant area of open countryside be justified?</li> <li>• Development would be right up against the AONB boundary.</li> <li>• Much of the North Site is on raised ground and will be visible from the surrounding area, much of which is AONB (possibly soon to be NP)</li> <li>• What are the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of vast areas from the Green Belt?</li> <li>• The openness of the Green Belt is a critical feature of all the sites.</li> <li>• Contrary to purposes of the Green Belt – encroachment into open countryside.</li> <li>• Some development close to the town edge might be possible although some distance from town centre and facilities and could be deemed unsustainable.</li> <li>• Has development in the town centre / existing urban area been maximised?</li> <li>• The additional water usage would be likely to have a detrimental impact on flows in the River Gade, which is one of the Chilterns' internationally important chalk streams.</li> <li>• The West of Hemel site (LA3) already has planning permission and Marchmont Farm has been accepted under the previous Plan and an application is imminent.</li> <li>• No account has been taken of the impact of the withdrawal of the St Albans Local Plan which the Inspector advised would not be found 'sound'. This has major implications for the much heralded 'Hemel Garden Communities' project ie 5500 dwellings north of Hemel Hempstead - another indication of the Plan being poorly thought out, unjustified and premature.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8822
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There is the argument that this consultation is poorly timed and extremely premature given that the government is revisiting the required housing figures and of course the pandemic which has changed how everyone now lives and works. The current situation has highlighted just how important open spaces are to the health and well-being of people and the loss of so much in Dacorum, especially around Hemel Hempstead, is totally unwarranted. As stated in NPPF, housing need alone is not an exceptional circumstance to allow such excessive loss of Green Belt land and such intrusive development. Around Hemel Hempstead alone some 392ha of Green Belt will be lost on the north west side where there are 3 blocks of land proposed for development despite Dacorum itself acknowledging that this is an area of high landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Spatial Vision, which gives the impression of low density development with substantial open spaces and landscaping, but as Transport for New Homes document (June 2020) headlines: 'Green Promises broken: garden villages will be dominated by the car', and given the amount of development proposed the housing density will be high, together with the added community facilities, there will be little land available for open space. This is clearly favoured by DBC as it was identified as one of several sites for such development and was given a grant of some £750,000 for consultants.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8855
<b>Person ID</b>	1266799
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Kelly
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are against this happening for multiple reasons from there being plenty of room in Hemel Hempstead that could be developed to accommodate housing.</p> <p>Also looking at your map one of the areas proposed to build on regularly floods which I have photos of because I live near by.</p> <p>If you build on the green belt it will reduce areas that can be grown on for food.</p> <p>It will also affect the eco system.</p> <p>I the current climate it would be increasing admissions/carbon dioxide to the are when we should be doing more to reduce it.</p> <p>According to you plans the local allotment will be built on when there is a 1900s law stating if 12 or more people want an allotment that this should be provided for them.</p> <p>There is also not enough school or hospitals ect in Hemel Hempstead to cope with these extra houses.</p> <p>The roads in the area are all read heavily congested</p> <p>To be honest the hole thing is ridicules.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8917
<b>Person ID</b>	1266852
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a local resident I am very concerned about this plan and would like the council to reconsider a number of issues. Please could you confirm that you have received this response.</p> <p>Whilst new homes are needed for local residents, the number of homes in this plan is far too high. The plan should be about Hemel being a nicer place to live, not about how to meet government building targets.</p> <p>I live in Boxmoor, it's a lovely area and I am a regular walker particularly around the moor and canal and between the station and Berkhamsted. It is beautiful green space that enhances our lives. The views are simply stunning and there is a great deal of wildlife.</p> <p>Large areas of greenbelt land will be used as part of this plan and it will then be gone forever. Once it has been released, developers will have a lot of flexibility about what they want to do with it, and this might not be what the people of Hemel need or want. To be able to build this huge number of homes, Dacorum Council will need to release greenbelt land and this should only ever be done in exceptional circumstances. These are not exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>To fit in this number of homes, many tall buildings will be built and this will make Hemel feel like a city rather than a rural town</p> <p>Only 70 of the homes proposed per year are expected to be social housing, how does this small number support local residents.</p> <p>Dacorum Council have declared a climate emergency, but this goes against your environmental ambitions as this amount of building will generate vast amounts of CO2 and it will remove green space, which soaks up CO2.</p> <p>There will not be enough water for this increase in population and the water companies have not set out a plan for how this will be dealt with.</p> <p>Building on greenbelt land will make Hemel even larger and so will increase car use.</p> <p>Any building plans should take into account how life has changed since Covid19 and Brexit – people are commuting less and working from home more.</p> <p>The greenbelt land is what makes Hemel a precious space to live, but if this plan goes through it will be lost and we will never be able to get it back. Future generations will need housing, but they also need us to create a place where they will have good quality of life and these plans will result in Hemel being a worse place to live rather than a better one. I urge the council to reconsider.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8930
<b>Person ID</b>	1266862
<b>Full Name</b>	Clare and Andrew Tucker



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are writing to express concern regarding the proposed development plan for Hemel Hempstead and surrounding areas. In particular our attention is drawn to the number of houses to be built, and the fact that this is proposed on greenbelt land. We don't feel that we have had enough time / opportunity / information (especially given the current covid situation) to properly digest what is being proposed and the implications for our community's future. We believe more consultation with the public is required at a time when people are able to safely participate in a public forum and have the capacity to do so.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8944
<b>Person ID</b>	1266879
<b>Full Name</b>	LEHUBY MAI-WAH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There are many reasons why i object to this development plan for new housing in Dacorum but mainly i believe the plan for the numbers of houses to build is far too high. The added homes will put pressure on the infrastructure - water, doctors surgeries, school place for the children living in those houses, the traffic on the London road and around Boxmoor which is already very busy pre pandemic will be even worse!

The area is classed as an area of outstanding beauty with lovely views and trees and the moor - we walk there every weekend and the Boxmoor trust do a fab job of keeping it well maintained. Its a beautiful area and i have lived in Boxmoor for 15 years- it's my home and if there are more houses and less greenery it will not be the same at all.

All this will add to the environmental challenges we already have and will not help with the aim to drive down Co2 emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9005

**Person ID** 1266980

**Full Name** Ms Janine Smith

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

As a local resident I am very concerned about this plan and would like the council to reconsider a number of issues. Please could you confirm that you have received this response.

Whilst new homes are needed for local residents, the number of homes in this plan is far too high. The plan should be about Hemel being a nicer place to live, not about how to meet government building targets.

I live in Boxmoor, it's a lovely area and I am a regular walker particularly around the moor and canal and between the station and Berkhamsted. It is beautiful green space that enhances our lives. The views are simply stunning and there is a great deal of wildlife and natural habitat.

Large areas of greenbelt land will be used as part of this plan and it will then be gone forever. Once it has been released, developers will have a lot of flexibility about what they want to do with it, and this might not be what the people of Hemel

need or want. To be able to build this huge number of homes, Dacorum Council will need to release greenbelt land and this should only ever be done in exceptional circumstances. These are not exceptional circumstances.

To fit in this number of homes, many tall buildings will be built and this will make Hemel feel like a city rather than a rural town

Only 70 of the homes proposed per year are expected to be social housing, how does this small number support local residents.

Dacorum Council have declared a climate emergency, but this goes against your environmental ambitions as this amount of building will generate vast amounts of CO2 and it will remove green space, which soaks up CO2.

There will not be enough water for this increase in population and the water companies have not set out a plan for how this will be dealt with.

Building on greenbelt land will make Hemel even larger and so will increase car use.

Any building plans should take into account how life has changed since Covid19 and Brexit – people are commuting less and working from home more.

The greenbelt land is what makes Hemel a precious space to live, but if this plan goes through it will be lost and we will never be able to get it back. Future generations will need housing, but they also need us to create a place where they will have good quality of life and these plans will result in Hemel being a worse place to live rather than a better one. I urge the council to reconsider.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9046

**Person ID** 1267059

**Full Name** Fiona Fulford

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the Hemel Gardens scheme, my understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9089
<b>Person ID</b>	1267072
<b>Full Name</b>	Anja Ganley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The number of homes that are supposed to be built is clearly too much. We haven't got the infrastructure (schools, roads, hospital) to cope with this large number of proposed housing. I like it that Hemel Hempstead is a smallish town within very easy reach of the countryside. Lots of places are walkable and accessible. In rush hour, the roads around Boxmoor do not cope, especially Fishery Road towards the station. We cannot build more housing without addressing these needs first. Are we going to build more schools? Are we going to have the West Herts hospital which was suggested? I would like to see these things addressed first.</p> <p>Furthermore, Boxmoor has got this lovely villagey feel with the moor. If high-rise buildings are built by the station, it would completely destroy the character of the village.</p>

I wish these issues could be discussed once the pandemic is over. It feels like the council is trying to rush these plans through while everybody is dealing with Covid, working from home and homeschooling. I guess the council thinks they will get away with it while we are busy with the pandemic. It is such a shame.

Please have a re-think and give the town time and proper plans to discuss.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9119

**Person ID** 1267082

**Full Name** Marie C

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Having lived in Hemel all of my life I have to say that seeing these plans is both disappointing and very sad. We have lots of green space in the area and yet already this town is being destroyed with ugly flats and houses appearing everywhere. We don't have a hospital, but why don't we put in thousands of houses and flats and wreck the town even more?! It's a disgrace. I seriously worry For future generations as places like Hemel, Berkhamsted and Tring are being ruined but I guess money talks! Where's the infrastructure? Are there enough police, schools, medical care?! Getting in and out of the Industrial Estate is a joke Crime seems to be on the increase as do people who play the benefits system. What's being done about this?

I am not proud of this town anymore but I guess you won't listen to the residents, no doubt we will see a hike in taxes soon as well.

I thought the Green Belt meant something?

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9161

<b>Person ID</b>	211352
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Sanderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see what BRAG have said about windfall numbers.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9171
<b>Person ID</b>	1267153
<b>Full Name</b>	SUZANNE HALLS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a local resident with a family that lives in Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>I wanted to say the level of housing proposed is very worrying for a number of reasons and should not be permitted on green belt or squeezed in to a rapidly overdeveloping town.</p>

\*Environmentally - Local water supplies are inadequate to support this level of housing and will cause major issues to current supplies. The additional demands on the landscape of these homes will not reduce the towns carbon footprint, it will make the situation worse increasing global warming and climate change.

\*Scale and Size - this amount of additional housing in Hemel and the surrounding areas will create the town into a city. The scale of this build is outdated, there is not the demand for this amount of housing or type of housing. Flats and apartments are taking over the area and are a short-term housing solution. People want houses with gardens, parking and space for a family, not more luxury apartments. High rise developments are also becoming unpopular due to cladding issues and what we have learned about germ spread during the pandemic.

\*Local Services - The current infrastructure, roads, hospitals, schools will not cope with the added pressure of these new homes.

\*Brexit - Reduction in EU migration will see the need for housing fall dramatically and the 2021 census population figures will demonstrate this. We need to consider the latest data to inform our decision making. We will end up with many empty buildings and half built structures if the demand for the housing does not exist.

I therefore see problems with the proposed local plan and wish these issue to be noted and considered very carefully

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9209

**Person ID** 1267203

**Full Name** Ms Eileen Martin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Question 4: Do you have specific comments about any of the Delivery Strategies?</p> <p>Yes It is not a properly representative, accessible Consultation.</p> <p>I believe only a small percentage of people have accessed the Consultation so it is of questionable validity. Your advertising has not been thorough enough for people to know about it.</p> <p>This is a period of upheaval to our lives, work and family household management. The Consultation is based on pre Covid experience. Going forward there may be changes that should be considered, like less commuting, fewer offices required, brownfield land coming available, changing life styles. We need to take time to form a Plan that fits with this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9216
<b>Person ID</b>	1264449
<b>Full Name</b>	Marion Anthony
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the plans for housing in and around Hemel Hempstead as laid out in the plans.</p> <p>As an already large town we have no hospital as such in hemel Hempstead plus the doctors surgeries are already very busy and I worry that I will have difficulty in getting seen by my doctor, I have a rare illness called sarcoidosis plus I have autism.</p> <p>The roads around where I live (address removed) are already very congested without new homes being built.</p> <p>We need our green spaces for our mental health and well being yet by looking at the plans they are going to be used for housing, where will the people go? Where is the room for children in schools and doctors and dentists?</p>



I feel that once the planners finish and leave this wonderful town will become a concrete city with no space left for wildlife and nature will be moved out. The small businesses that are currently in place will have to move out for housing, we will lose a lot of trade and jobs.

I know that the country has to build new homes but at what cost to the people that already live here, have we no rights to the life that the countryside gives us, becoming an area of vast overpopulation will damage the wellbeing and mental health of us for years to come and only when it is too late and the NHS will be overwhelmed with people who become depressed and their mental health deteriorate will they realise that it boils down to living in a concrete place with hardly any green areas and no local community as the jobs will disappear as no commercial areas are left.

Thank you for taking the time in reading this letter of objection.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9423
<b>Person ID</b>	1264988
<b>Full Name</b>	Michelle Shearer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to share my formal response to reading the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) growth plan. Whilst I can appreciate change is inevitable the sheer level of development over the next 18 years is almost impossible to comprehend.</p> <p>Specifically Hemel Hempstead, as this has been my hometown for the past 17 years, has plans for approx 10,500 new dwellings during this period of the proposed total 18,000. I moved from London to leafy Hemel Hempstead and totally loved the balance of buildings and green space. There was one noticeably tall building, previously referred to as The Kodak Tower nestled amongst the backdrop of greenery and mix of old and new buildings from Hemel's historical past and development into a new town in the 1950s.</p>

To fulfil the governments building targets I cannot help to feel that Hemel lose much of it's individual rural town charm and instead look and feel more like a city due to the tall buildings, sheer size and density of its ultimate growth which will consume many green areas in doing so. Local towns will lose their identities as their distinct boundaries will almost merge, where one once ended will be where another begins.

The proposals will attract more commuters and therefore bring little substantial positive change to the issues of demand for social housing, affordable rents, housing prices, healthcare and education which have been increasing for many years already and not meeting its residents needs.

It is a shame that the wonderful town I chose to call home in 2004 will have changed so much that not only will it be unrecognisable for me but also my two sons who would have grown up and remember it so differently too.

Please take the time to review projections and proposals of this plan as we will never have this opportunity again to retain our greenbelt lands and rural balance, only regrets of many for things to have been done differently if this irreversible plan goes ahead in its current capacity.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9546

**Person ID** 1267432

**Full Name** David Fox

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

- On the Hemel Gardens scheme, my understanding is that St Albans have withdrawn their involvement in the Hemel Garden Communities strategy on legal advice that it would not be 'found sound'. This then rather brings the Hemel section of this joint strategy within this plan into question.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9567
<b>Person ID</b>	1267440
<b>Full Name</b>	Mick Maloney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It's important that we have an infrastructure that can support any new developments. We don't have enough doctors, dentists or schools. We don't have a hospital. Our roads can't cope with the amount of traffic – the tailbacks at the current roadworks at Box Lane are long even though many people are working from home and children aren't at school. Any roadworks through Apsley or around Durrants Hill or Red Lion Lane causes chaos as does any problem on the M25 which means all the traffic comes through Hemel to get to the M1.</p> <p>We should look to provide a SENSIBLE number of homes, per year and develop areas that are already built on, for example the town centre and the hospital site, who in their right mind would build a hospital UP a hill making it difficult for the infirm to get to?!</p> <p>All developments should be in keeping with the area, no tower blocks or high-rise buildings. We are a TOWN. Smaller developments, with green spaces, good size gardens and local facilities are essential.</p> <p>Finally after such a terrible year I think it is VERY important to consider mental health. I feel that locally we are lucky with all our green spaces and green belt land. If we continue to build developments such as those at Chaulden and Marchmont Fields, let alone the tower blocks suggested near the station and Two Waters we won't have much left. How would the Council like to be remembered?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9750
<b>Person ID</b>	1264471
<b>Full Name</b>	Ashley Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The plans are based on out of date data from 2014 that no longer reflects the current housing need. Using the 2018 data would halve the amount of housing that is actually required.</p> <p>The condition of the highways are in a poor state and congestion at peak times are already overwhelming for the towns infrastructure. This proposal would hugely overwhelm congestion and severely impact on pollution and air quality.</p> <p>The town has no proper A&amp;E department nor birthing facility and the Hemel Hospital site has been campaigned for over many years to no avail. Doctors surgeries are already overwhelmed with too many patients.</p> <p>Hemel has no police station.</p> <p>Our streets are already heavily congested with parked vehicles. Recent approved housing developments have had insufficient parking facilities for its residents.</p> <p>Covid lockdown has proven the need for public open green spaces and with many new developments including large numbers of flats and apartments the need to keep our green spaces is hugely important for the wellbeing and health of the community.</p> <p>The impact on local wildlife that would lose their habits would be enormous.</p> <p>Following the fuel depot fire many years ago at Maylands avenue it is concerning the amount of development that is being planned and has been built so close to the site.</p> <p>Will there be sufficient water supply for so many additional dwellings? The fact that water would need to be extracted from the chalk aquifer will damage the boroughs chalk rivers which are classified as priority habitats by the natural environmental and rural communities act 2006.</p> <p>I am opposing the plans set out. The scale of this project is far too excessive and our town would be crippled by such a huge development with little infrastructure to support such an increase in population, pollution and the impact of loss of our green land would be astronomical.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9761
<b>Person ID</b>	1267517

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Kevin Hutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I've lived in Boxmoor/Felden all my life. Please keep any development 4-storeys (or less) around the moor in line with other domiciles & businesses. It's a lovely area & a higher rise development would spoil what we have & the additional traffic would cause unacceptable congestion at peak commuter times.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9840
<b>Person ID</b>	1267728
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHANIE PARKES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to you to voice my concerns over the planned proposal of new homes being built in Boxmoor which is destroying to the village and wildlife surrounding the area.</p> <p>Firstly the amount of homes being built is very concerning and clearly just the government hitting their own future targets rather than caring about Boxmoor being a nice rural part of Hemel Hempstead and keeping this beauty. I wake up every morning and stroll through the moor and around boxmoor as this is an outstanding beauty which I care so deeply about.</p>

This will ruin my personal lifestyle and experience I have living in Boxmoor and the new plans goes against the reason I chose to live here.

There is so much nature and green belt land that will be destroyed in the process which we will never get back. You have to realise that we are in a rural community and not a city!!! This clearly goes against environmental issues as this amount of building will generate huge amount of CO2 and taking away the green belt land will soak up more of this.

I go against everything in the plan for these new homes as your taking so much away with it. This is an area of outstanding beauty and high storey buildings will destroy this and environmentally is extremely concerning.

One of my other concerns is that Boxmoor high street is starting to really feel like a community with the shops working hard through COVID-19 and then to potentially hit an obstacle with more shops added near the train station.

I really hope you listen to these views and I'm sure that I am not the only one who feels so strongly about this.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9910

**Person ID** 1267772

**Full Name** JULIE COURT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** My Parents moved to HH from London in the 50s. They were part of the 'New Town' idea - satellite towns around London to accommodate families from London and possibly it's slums.

They loved their new life in the 'country' along with my brother and sister both under 10 years old. They knew that no matter what, as this town was surrounded by 'green belt' it would always stay a small town in the countryside- what better way to provide a good life for your children and future generations?

They had a shiny new hospital built, shops, schools, parks, doctors surgeries... it was idyllic for them.

My sister has since told me how the original Hemelites hated the newcomers and what they did to their small town... ripping down buildings and 'developing' areas.... I do not blame them and can empathise with them completely.

One only has to look on Facebook to read how people now mourn the loss of such beautiful buildings and places... and cannot understand why places like Berkhamsted, Tring and St Albans have retained their charm and character managing to remain pretty, yet functional places to live.. they love the community we have but are sad for the loss of the beautiful town we could have been...

Hemel is now soulless. I was born in 1964, and I grew up in Hemel Hempstead- I loved my town yet as the years have passed I am more and more disillusioned with the planner's poor decisions- I do not understand what you are trying to do to our town?

History is repeating itself but now, it's not the beautiful old buildings being ripped apart it's our beautiful green belt- our surrounding countryside, our green space that my parents were told would ALWAYS be protected. Their legacy is being trampled on, they came here for a new life for themselves and their children yet, now I am saddened to find I don't want this awful town for my children and grandchildren, or indeed myself... as soon as we are able we are leaving Hemel because the town planners do not listen or are not interested in what the people of Hemel Hempstead want.

We need schools, a hospital, pretty little shops, department stores, proper police station.... the list is endless yet DBC charged extortionate rent/rates and plan more housing in a town with absolutely no infrastructure to support it. Yes I am aware that HCC and other government bodies are responsible for some of these things but building more housing will only add pressure onto the already crumbling infrastructure... and Dacorum BC, it's councillors, it's MPs should all be focused on fighting on behalf of their townsfolk to retain the green belt, stop new buildings planning and improve/reinstate the facilities we do desperately need.

I do not understand why or how anyone would feel it is in anyone's interests to build more housing on our greenbelt land when it cannot support properly those already living in the town.

Please reconsider this terrible plan, the town is dying and you are killing it off.

I do not support the plans and object to the programme 100%.

Let's try to make Hemel Hempstead a nice place to live - together. Please do not destroy my parents legacy.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9991

**Person ID** 1267852

**Full Name** MATT JUDD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** As a lifelong resident of boxmoor, I am disgusted to see the level of housing that is being proposed as part of the growth strategy. Hemel is already lacking the infrastructure needed to support its current residents....the road system is stretched and town centre itself is as good as dead. One of hemel greatest selling points is the fact that it has many areas of beautiful parks, canals and greenbelt areas. The level (and type) of housing being proposed is not sustainable and will certainly not benefit the residents of hemel.

The online portal is not user friendly, so pls accept this email as an official response of concern to this proposal.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10038



<b>Person ID</b>	218427
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Bruce Kent
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My conclusion is that development should concentrate on the existing location of Hemel Hempstead, where facilities already exist or can easily be expanded, pending a further review when the full impact of recent events can be properly assessed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10099
<b>Person ID</b>	1268043
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNE HAYDEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>OBJECTIONS</p> <p>HH13 Frogmore Road</p> <p>170 dwellings in yet another small space is ridiculous. It's all very well putting a pedestrian bridge in, but when it's vehicular access that is a major issue, it will exacerbate the problem by adding volumes of new vehicles.</p>

We already have three new monstrosities on the front end of the site - NO MORE. Build some houses so you still have homes but will be more in keeping with the area overall.

HH15 Ebbens Road

30 dwellings (and will probably end up being more) on Ebbens Road is a nonsense. Once again, there is one way in and one way out and even the CPZ will not make any difference to this. Any homes MUST have spaces for 2 cars as there's not enough space now. We need houses down here, not more tower blocks that cram people in to meet targets. Keep buildings below 2 stories - this road was a Victorian style terraced area that had character to it but with the modern buildings going up, it has changed the area dramatically.

You're ruining the area with huge blocks that look like prison blocks and putting them in areas with little to no thought about the parking or traffic jams.

You need to do traffic surveys at peak times, not mid-afternoon on a Sunday when people aren't rushing to get to work - or at least trying to.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10147

**Person ID** 1208053

**Full Name** Nick Wilson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Road Infrastructure/Congestion  
There seems little information in 'The Plan' with regards enhancement of road infrastructure. With the considerable numbers of new houses planned, the existing road system around Dacorum will not be able to cope, specifically in Hemel Hempstead where I live.

The sheer numbers of houses planned, both surrounding the town and in the centre are too many. It's naïve to imagine that the majority of people will move around the town by foot or bicycle – and with our proximity to the A41, M1 & M25, many will be vehicle commuters.

Already, the Link Road onto the Redbourn Road sees busy commuter traffic, as does Maylands Estate onto the M1 and Two Waters Road & Boxmoor onto the A41. Traffic numbers will not decrease. People are not going to walk, cycle or take the bus. The canal & railway line bisects the town, separating road users from the A41 and creating traffic bottlenecks at key locations across the town. Congestion will increase.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10171
<b>Person ID</b>	1268078
<b>Full Name</b>	Corran & Mark Griffin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having read through the Dacorum Local Plan we have the following feedback and observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 We understand the need for more family homes and support regeneration of the area. Much of Hemel Hempstead in particular is tired and the road infrastructure is appalling, with long queues in all directions at peak hours, leading to the “magic roundabout” bottleneck. A plan which sympathetically provides high quality family housing, open spaces and better infrastructure is welcome.</li> <li>2 What is not welcome however is the destruction of 2,000 acres of greenbelt. Once this is built on it will never be reclaimed. Building on green belt should be the absolute LAST RESORT, when there are no other options available.</li> <li>3 Allowing Dacorum to sprawl, swallowing up pretty hamlets and villages in an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) should also be avoided. The proposed housing developments will have a significant and detrimental input on the natural environment.</li> </ol>

- 4 We consider the Local Plan has not explored the regeneration of brown field sites sufficiently, especially in light of how shopping and working practices have altered as a result of the coronavirus pandemic. The use of existing town centre sites needs to be explored more thoroughly.
- 5 We consider the calculations behind this plan to be flawed and based on obsolete data. Why does Dacorum need 25% more homes? The Local Plan should be based on the ONS figures from 2018 NOT the out of date 2014 ONS figures which appear to have been used.
- 6 As per point 1, the roads in and around Dacorum are already congested. It frequently takes 20+ minutes to do a 5 mile trip across the borough. Adding 25% more cars is going to make this situation worse. The proposed new link road doesn't actually appear to link to anything at all. All the feeder roads to the new link road from Tring and Berkhamsted are narrow and or single lane. This is going to result in worse traffic and queues, in effect exporting Hemel's traffic problems out to the surrounding villages which are not equipped to deal with more cars.
- 7 The proposed area for the Hemel Garden Communities (HCG) housing is in the wrong place. The area doesn't have any existing transport infrastructure. The station, the M25, the A41 and the M1 are all to the south or south east. Therefore HCG residents in this area are going to have to travel through the centre of Hemel Hempstead to gain access to the key transport hubs. Apart from the aforementioned link road, which doesn't actually seem to link anything, there is no explanation in the Local Plan of what the transport plan is going to be. HCG should be re-located to the east of the borough and ideally a new M1 junction (8A?) should be built to keep pressure off Junction 8 which is already extremely busy.
- 8 The Local Plan omits any reference to a separate 400 house development already submitted under planning reference 21/00171/SCE. 21/00171/SCE seems to be trying to sneaked in under the radar separately, rather than being considered as part of an overall cohesive plan. With the 5,500 homes proposed in the Hemel Garden Communities under the Local Plan and the 400 under 21/00171/SCE, it is actually another 6000 new homes being propsoed in the same small area north of Hemel Hempstead.
- 9 In summary we STRONGLY OPPOSE the Local Plan in its current form. It needs a major re-think on what the overall objective is. The fundamental question that needs to be answered is **why does Dacorum need 25% more houses/people/cars/pollution/water usage/crime?**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10178

**Person ID** 1268083

**Full Name** TIM WOOD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to submit my opinion that the current plan is not suitable for the Hemel Hempstead and boxmoor area. My points of objection include:</p> <p>The proposed number of dwellings is too high and will be detrimental to both the local environment and the quality of life for both current and future residents. The qualities of this town are that there is a good mix of both accommodation and local green and natural spaces that can be enjoyed by all. With both the loss of some of this green space for development and a substantial increase in the number of residents the ability to enjoy these spaces will be diminished.</p> <p>If tall buildings are allowed to be built that are not in keeping with the current architecture and environs this will set precedent that will destroy the look and feel of the town. Building at boxmoor station will detract from its location at the edge of the naturally significant and valuable boxmoor trust land that borders the station area. As large amounts of green belt land within Dacorum are proposed sites for development, to mar the look of areas that border green spaces would be very displeasing.</p> <p>The environmental impact of more homes on the water supply and drainage of the local area is a subject that does not appear to have been sufficiently addressed in the plan as stated.</p> <p>Any proposed area of housing development must provide buildings and services that would allow local social groups to meet, be it the young such as scouts and guides etc to the elderly with space for meeting and social interaction. To build large numbers of housing without significant social facilities and planning for how they can be maintained would be a disservice to the local communities that Dacorum borough council serves.</p> <p>In short there are too many houses planned with too much proposed development that will detract from the communities within Dacorum and the plan does not appear to accomplish the objective of helping the current social housing shortfall. The environment and social impact on the current residents and local area would be significant and detrimental.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10289

<b>Person ID</b>	1268242
<b>Full Name</b>	MR & MRS A FERGUSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We have just read through the above planning strategy for Hemel Hempstead and surrounding areas. We can only say that we are truly appalled at the amount of areas being considered for development in particular the area around Two Water and Boxmoor.</p> <p>There are obvious areas that require improvement such as the Symbio site, which is an eyesore, and the station which could do with improving but to consider high rise buildings of 10 - 16 storeys high is dreadful. Plus of course, the traffic around the area is bad enough already without adding yet more in the numbers that can only be assumed but realistically, the addition of vehicles whether they be private or business, would be extensive and do little to improve air quality in the area.</p> <p>Whilst we understand requirements for building, we oppose this plan in its current format and would like said opposition recorded.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10372
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>These large sites are north and east of the town, HH1 and 2 totalling 2000</p> <p>Note that 450 are on the current hospital site HH3, despite the plan to revamp the hospital facilities, query will there be space for that too?</p> <p>Already allocated sites are HH21 West Hemel (1150) and HH22 Marchmont Farm (385)</p> <p>The numbers of proposed houses are mind boggling, in particular the huge swathe to the north of Hemel. Starting with the Marchmont Farm area impinging on Piccotts End, a small and historic conservation area village. HH1 4000 dwellings -The Hemel Garden Communities is then being considered, providing a band around the rest of North Hemel. This development is close to and will be visible from the AONB and of course it is all GREEN BELT! The increased pressure on our beautiful Ashridge, Gade Valley Water Meadows etc will be immense in terms of traffic, pollution, visible intrusion and wildlife impact.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10464
<b>Person ID</b>	1268450
<b>Full Name</b>	JOSEPH STOPPS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	DACORUM GREEN PARTY
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Hemel Hempstead bears the majority of the development across the borough with no legal commitment to social and environmental areas.</p> <p>Areas of serious concern:</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead would be affected in a similar way to Tring . The pressure on crucial infrastructure it is difficult to justify. The increase in traffic around the existing road network would cause major issues and increases in emissions (contravening SA Objectives 4 &amp; 5)</p>

Whilst it is recognised that development of this scale would require water extraction that would have a serious impact on the land and environment, it is also true that once the development is approved the water companies are required by law to provide water and waste provision. There is nowhere in the local plan that recognises this serious environmental impact.

The largest block of development to the North of Hemel Hempstead is on Green Belt land that is vital to absorb rainfall, which in turn mitigates future flooding. There is inadequate recognition of the effect of run-off water to the delicate protected chalk stream of the Gade that the plan would bring. Similar concerns have been ignored in the LA3 development which predates the new Local Plan.

The development stops short of building on areas recognised as being of outstanding natural beauty but fails to recognise that it is within the view of the aforesaid area of natural beauty which would impair the value of what is left.

The assurance that developers would replant after the destruction of existing mature forest and Woodland does not recognise the pressures that rewilding would require during development and furthermore does not give any compulsory use of locally sourced saplings that would mitigate the risks of introducing arboreal disease that has been prevalent in other replanting that has been sourced from the continent (meeting SA Objective 1).

Increasing public transport needs to be a compulsory ironclad guarantee within the development, with any infrastructure such as roads recognising the need for bus routes to be considered . Despite the production in on the ground retail opportunities within housing developments, there must be 'village centres' that are a hallmark of the rest of the previous development of Hemel Hempstead. These should include places of worship .

To avoid natural spaces that have been referred to as 'landscaping' becoming purely dog walking spaces, there must be minimum dimension spaces to allow for natural growth and biodiversity which also includes woodland.

Existing cycle paths in Hemel Hempstead are not joined up, starting and stopping in strange places. This only encourages leisure cycling and discourages cycling as a safe form of transport. A guaranteed commitment to a fully integrated cycling network must be part of the plan for Hemel Hempstead.

The final large concern is that with an increase of housing/population that is being suggested, there is inadequate Hospital provision. Even if the plan is adjusted to recognise the government's own data of a reduced volume of housing, an extension to the local plan must include some form of Hospital and A&E provision.



New blocks of development are separated from the rest of the town by the industrial zone or by having no natural routes to connect with existing areas without serious disruption and unreasonable pressure on exiting infrastructures.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10542

**Person ID** 1268671

**Full Name** Mr Mike Jennings

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

The delivery strategies are inappropriate because the premise of the housing need / development growth is not sustainable and lacks justification because the council has over estimated the requirement for growth, exceeding the Governments requirements. Dacorum is a Borough with a large area identified as of environmental importance. The present demands on the environment are causing a deterioration in the environment. Hence the proposed growth will further damage the environment, especially around Tring and Berkhamsted. Mitigation measures are required that will result in Net Environmental Gain NEG (as identified in the NPPF). A high quality environment surrounds these towns, albeit deteriorating due to current recreational pressures. Sufficient measures to provide NEG are not feasible within the local environment. Offsetting the impacts elsewhere will not compensate for the impacts on the local environment. This will inevitably lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the SAC, SSSI's and local areas of importance to biodiversity.

These adverse impacts do not comply with the local policies and national legislation.

Delivery strategies in the plan need to take into account the latest information with respect to carbon, nitrogen and nutrient neutrality issues (In Practice December 2020, Page 6 Nutrient neutrality; Air pollution Pages 7-10; Nitrogen pollution Pages 11 - 14). The reference provided has other articles that are also relevant in the context of all local plans.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10614
<b>Person ID</b>	1268731
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRIS LUTHER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to register my opposition to the proposal for the plan to create almost two thousand houses in Hemel Hempstead by the year 2038.</p> <p>Such a huge development would have a catastrophic impact on the local area and surrounding villages. It appears to me that no consideration has been given to local residents and their quality of life that the extra traffic and accompanying pollution would bring.</p> <p>What is the point of designated green-belt areas if they can be built upon?</p> <p>These areas of outstanding natural beauty should be preserved, not desecrated. They should be allowed to flourish, as should the wildlife that lives within.</p> <p>The effect of the pandemic will bring many challenges, not least to the mental health and wellbeing of many people. Being in nature, and enjoying local green spaces is of great benefit to all, in particular those fragile and vulnerable people with mental health issues.</p> <p>The narrow roads around the villages will find the extra traffic difficult to cope with in the extreme, should the proposal be implemented. The beautiful villages of Water End and Piccotts End would be ruined, the resident's peace shattered by this proposed development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10687
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see what BRAG have said about windfall numbers.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10878
<b>Person ID</b>	1149755
<b>Full Name</b>	MR CHRIS PICHON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Your definition of 'Growth' needs to be completely redefined considering the effects of Covid and Brexit. Growth will not necessarily be just based on jobs. Home working, the growth of the internet and the introduction of High Speed Broadband will completely change the working dynamics. This Plan is totally based on 'out of date thinking and forecasts' It lacks the vision of the future where for instance town centres will be very different concepts than just retail.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10930
<b>Person ID</b>	1059452

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Angela Whitehead
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Trying to get in and out of Hemel in the rush hour is becoming more difficult by the day, how is this number of houses going to help.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10965
<b>Person ID</b>	1268889
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Clair Sears
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>One of the best things about Hemel is it's green space and rural feel. It is a town, not a city, and I do not want it to turn into an overcrowded area full of high rise buildings which is what is proposed in the Plan.</p> <p>The greenbelt land is hugely important and should not be released unless for exceptional reasons. Building too many properties, which will not benefit more than a fraction of those requiring social housing, is simply not an exceptional reason.</p>

Removing green space whilst generating harmful CO2 is not environmentally responsible behaviour and completely goes against the environmental statements Dacorum Council have made regarding the Climate emergency in the past. Furthermore additional homes brings additional cars and further impact on the environment.

I live in Boxmoor and am lucky to enjoy beautiful views of the Moors, river and Canal from my house. Every day my family enjoys our immediate green surroundings- it is so important for our physical and mental wellbeing to have these green spaces around us and not more dwellings. We have a huge array of wildlife in Boxmoor and a very green landscape. This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and should be maintained, not destroyed which is what will happen if this Local Plan is approved.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10966

**Person ID** 1268889

**Full Name** Ms Clair Sears

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** There is no information as to how the infrastructure will cope with the additional number of homes proposed. How will utilities fulfil this many new houses? How will schools, doctors and other services cope?

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11327

**Person ID** 1269003

**Full Name** Mr Nick Banks

**Organisation Details** Regional Director (South East)

Richborough Estates

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Growth Area HH01: North Hemel Hempstead (Phases 1 and 2)</b> Further to my letter, February 2020, I would like to express Richborough's ongoing interest regarding the subject - land (registered with title no. HD430584 and HD485668} which we understand has been proposed as a residential allocation within Dacorum Borough Council's emerging Local Plan.  Richborough Estates is a specialist strategic land promotion business founded in 2003 to assist landowners in maximising the value of their holdings through the planning process. Typically, our projects are urban extensions of between 50 to 2,000 dwellings. We are currently promoting approximately 30,000 dwellings across the United Kingdom and control over 100 sites.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Richborough Estates - Nick Banks - Postal Full page photo_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11544
<b>Person ID</b>	1149269
<b>Full Name</b>	Harriet Twigger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b><u>Comments on the New Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038</u></b>

Dacorum Borough Council (“DBC”) has invited its residents to submit comments on the New Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038 (“the Local Plan”).

I am writing to say that I am very concerned about the proposals set out in the Local Plan, particularly the excessive housing development planned for North Hemel (Phase 1).

The amount of housing required seems to be completely out of proportion to local requirements and according to the countryside charity CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) Hertfordshire the plan has been calculated on outdated data from 2014.

The continued concentration of house building in the South East also seems to be at odds with the current Government’s expressed desire to “level up”.

I have seen nothing in the Local Plan that convinces me that there are “exceptional circumstances” that justify building on green belt land and a nationally important area of natural beauty.

The River Gade is a chalk stream, a globally rare and vulnerable habitat. As the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust says: “Chalk streams are the UK’s equivalent to tropical rainforests. They support a huge variety of rare and vulnerable wildlife. Some of our most iconic and well-loved species like the Water Vole, Wild Brown Trout and Mayflies, depend solely on these rivers to survive in Hertfordshire.”

The upper section of the High Gade Valley lies in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“Chilterns AONB”) and is protected. However, it is extremely important that the section of the Gade Valley, which lies between the Chilterns AONB and north Hemel Hempstead, is also protected for future generations.

DBC, itself, has identified this as an important local habitat to conserve and strengthen. The 2004 DBC paper “Landscape Character Assessment of the High Gade Valley”, recommends the following policies (amongst others) in relation to this area:

- restrict further built development within the valley and develop a strategy for mitigating existing
- resist development that could lower the water table within river valleys and affect wetland
- promote the expansion of woodland ... and hedgerow

It seems that, not only is DBC now proposing to build 1,550 houses in this area, but it also plans to turn part of this beautiful habitat into a recycling and refuse depot.

The amount of new housing will put immense pressure on local infrastructure, especially water supply. Over-abstraction of water is a significant threat to chalk streams and the surrounding environment. As noted above, this risk factor was identified by DBC in 2004.

DBC is drafting an Infrastructure Development Plan to explain how the increased demand for water will be met and also how the other pressures on local infrastructure will be met. However, it seems that the answers are not currently available. It cannot be right that the Local Plan should be approved, without solutions to such fundamental issues having been identified.

George Eustice, the Environment Secretary has expressed Central Government's concern to "front-load ecological considerations in the planning development process". As, he said on 20 July 2020: "This Government's pledge is not only to stem the tide of loss, but to turn it around - to leave the environment in a better state than we found it."

I would like to see DBC do more to put this Government pledge into action and to protect our environment. An important step towards this would be to withdraw the proposed Local Plan for North Hemel.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11600

**Person ID** 1269148

**Full Name** SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**



<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Hemel Hempstead</b>  Hemel Hempstead is almost entirely surrounded by Green Belt with the original town located on the valley floor, with steeply rising slopes, now with creeping development up the valley sides.  The scale of development proposed is excessive and will result in the loss of a significant area of open countryside especially in the Gade Valley, a beautiful, relatively undeveloped valley with steep sides. All the proposed development is up the sides of the valley thus it will be seen from long distances and crucially from the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Not only seen from but will be built up to its boundary which is clearly not acceptable, especially as this area may become a National Park, the most important landscape designation in the country.  There are no exceptional circumstances to remove the sites from the Green Belt. Two sites within the Green Belt, land west of Hemel Hempstead and Marchmont Farm have already been granted planning permission resulting in the loss of some 75ha of Green Belt land and the provision of some 1485 dwellings.  Development should be concentrated in the existing urban area of the town and concentrating on brownfield sites and the reuse of shops and offices and other conversions.  The additional water usage would be likely to have a detrimental impact on flows in the River Gade, which is one of the Chilterns' internationally important chalk streams.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11736
<b>Person ID</b>	1269229
<b>Full Name</b>	NITA MOSS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to strongly object to the New Dacorum Local Plan for Dacorum.

I have been living in Hemel Hempstead for the past 30 years and see it going downhill in that time in terms funding of the essential infrastructure needed for a town this size but yet money is found to fund more and more houses in the area, ruining the essence of the town itself.

The police and hospital have not been supported over the years and are now disappearing altogether. More and more houses and flats are being built in areas that are already full to the brim and inadequate car parking for these properties means that cars get parked on any little available space all along the roads, blocking pedestrian access and causing congestion on the roads in the morning.

I am going to specifically refer to the Frogmore Road and Ebbens Road new build plans because from personal experience there are already horrendous traffic jams on Durrants Hill down the one way hill towards London Road and onto London Road which is an issue everyday. These new properties on the plan will just add to nightmare we face day in day out. Ebbens Road is one massive car park as inadequate parking provisions from property built there already in the last few years has pushed people to park their multiple cars on the road blocking pedestrian paths and there is no way two cars can pass on the road causing people to stop and start all along the road to pass one way or the other causing noise and pollution all day long. Both Frogmore Road and Ebbens Road are close to the canal and home to wildlife which has been pushed out and no regard paid to its preservation. Durrants Hill and London Road in Apsley gets flooded every time there is a bit of heavy rain and has been dug up more times in the past year than we can count on our hands. The pollution levels in this area is horrendous with constant cars in queues on Durrants Hill and London Road spewing out fumes. Durrants Hill is an inadequate road for all this extra traffic to be using.

Hemel Hempstead has lovely greenbelt areas which we were once proud of but all you see now you drive down any road are flats after flats and house after house. The skyline will be ruined with all the high rise flat plans listed. Every household has two or more cars nowadays but that is not being considered at all.

Why are we being asked to approve of these plans when you have no consideration to the people that live in Hemel already and need use of the essentials - we don't want to go to Watford through congestion and traffic when a town the size you want it to be eventually should have its own facilities.

I urge you to rethink the number of properties that are being in Hemel and not make Hemel a town that everyone that lives in it now want to move away from.

**Included files**

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS11893
<b>Person ID</b>	1269277
<b>Full Name</b>	DEFINE PLANNING AND DESIGN LTD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>BHL supports the production of a delivery strategy for the Hemel Hempstead Garden Community and the Council’s recognition that the Hemel Garden Communities project has the potential to act as a “<i>major catalyst for the transformation of the town.</i>” It does, however, have differing views in relation to the timing of development, as discussed in more detail in response to Question 5 below.</p> <p><b>POLICY SP14 – DELIVERING HEMEL GARDEN COMMUNITIES:</b></p> <p>BHL supports the reference made within Policy SP14 that Hemel Hempstead should be “<i>the focus for the majority of the Borough’s growth</i>” and that “<i>this expansion presents a major opportunity for the transformation of the town.</i>” In addition to that, BHL supports the importance that is placed on the Garden City Principles and the principles of the Hemel Garden Communities Charter.</p> <p><b>POLICY SP15 – DELIVERING GROWTH IN HEMEL HEMPSTEAD:</b></p> <p>BHL supports the focusing of growth to the North Hemel Hempstead Growth Area given the importance placed on the Hemel Garden Community project within the plan, as well as the focusing of growth elsewhere in the town. Indeed, that approach to development within the town reflects DBC’s inherent recognition that the land to the north of Hemel Hempstead (referred to as sites HH01 and HH02) are suitable for development, be that in the current plan period or the next plan period.</p> <p>However, it is BHL’s position that HH02 should be released for development within the upcoming plan period (i.e. between 2020 and 2038) as part of this local plan review.</p> <p>Indeed, BHL’s representations to Policy SP2 noted that the Council’s minimum housing need is incorrectly calculated and should be 18,450 dwellings, but that the Council should seek to identify c. 20,000 dwellings within the plan period to allow for a buffer over that value to ensure flexibility in the Borough’s land supply. To demonstrate a supply of 20,000 dwellings, DBC would be required to identify a further 3,101 dwellings in the Borough. Those sites should be primarily identified in the key settlements of Hemel Hempstead, Tring and Berkhamsted, given their position in the settlement</p>

hierarchy. Therefore, given that site HH02 has clearly been demonstrated as being suitable, it should be allocated (or at the very least part allocated) for development in the current plan period.

**POLICY SP16 – NORTH AND EAST OF HEMEL HEMPSTEAD GROWTH AREAS:**

BHL supports the broad scope of this policy, and the Council’s commitment to bringing forward development in the Hemel Hempstead Garden Community / Growth Areas.

However, requirement 4 requires development to contribute “*towards the 60% modal share aspiration for North and East Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas by 2050 and 40% for the rest of the town.*” However, that requirement is ambiguous. For that requirement to be consistent with NPPF paragraph 16d further information required to allow for easy interpretation of planning applications; namely, what the Council’s ‘modal aspiration’ is, whether the 60% refers to a 60% increase or 60% total, how the 60% modal share is measured (i.e. is it 60% of all journeys, 60% of passengers, etc.?), and what is considered to be a sufficient contribution to the modal share aspiration.

Furthermore, requirement 5 requires developments to “*contribute to net-zero carbon emissions, in line with other policies in this plan.*” BHL have responded to the requirements of Policies DM23 and SP10, stating that DBC must ensure that “*the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan*” (Ref. 10-002-20190509), and those comments remain relevant here.

In addition, requirement 6 requires developments to “*facilitate or contribute to circular economy principles.*” Whilst BHL recognises the importance of eliminating waste / promoting the re-use of materials, the wording of this policy is unclear, and fails to state what a sufficient ‘contribution’ to circular economy principles would be. This requirement should be clarified or removed as a result.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11971

**Person ID** 1264526

**Full Name** Peter King

**Organisation Details** Water End & Upper Gade Valley Conservation Society

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hemel Garden Community</b></li> </ul> <p>This Community, to be built on green belt agricultural land bordering the Upper Gade Valley ANOB, is a massive increase in the population which currently exists in the surrounding villages and hamlets. Sustainability is supposed to be achieved by having a tree planted per person. The Plan does not detail the science behind this , what types of tree etc. It would appear to be no more an imaginative wild thought to try and justify what is a totally unsustainable development. Proposals relating to Garden communities are supposed to include consultation with existing local communities. To the best of our knowledge this has not happened, certainly this Society had not heard of it until it came out in the Plan. The concept appears to be one of the planners trying to justify building on the Green Belt</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12032
<b>Person ID</b>	1207341
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Adam Wood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth and Infrastructure Manager Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (and Herts IQ)
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264277
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Rob Shipway
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Lead Consultant Civix
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.6 – 23.9 Hemel Garden Communities (HGC) Delivery Strategy</p> <p>The LEP is a partner in HGC, fully supports its vision and objectives and will work with other partners to secure its delivery. The references in the ESG Delivery Strategy entirely accord with our view of the initiative.</p> <p>23.10 - 23.13 Governance and oversight issues</p> <p>The LEP is wholly supportive of governance arrangements and the Mission Statement, providing as it does a commitment to agreed principles and strategic issues.</p> <p>23.14 – 23.16 Joint working with St Albans</p>

The LEP notes the commitment of both authorities to work together to deliver the HGC Spatial Vision and, within it, a comprehensive and seamless masterplan across the two local authorities, and strongly welcomes such arrangements.

#### 23.17 – 23.19 Herts IQ

The agreed partnership arrangements to deliver a range of high value businesses, covering expansion of the Maylands Business Park and 55 ha of employment in St Albans, is strongly supported by Herts LEP.

#### 23.78 - 23.81 and Policy SP17 Key Area Strategy – Hemel Hempstead Town Centre

The LEP recognises the role the town centre plays in the borough's social, cultural, educational and retail hub, and that within this its critical role in providing employment and entrepreneurial opportunities. In the light of this the measures in the ESG intended to promote environmental improvements, ensure better accessibility and a provide for more varied range of employment activities are very welcome, particularly in the light of the pressures town centres across the UK are currently coming under.

#### 23.82 – 23.90 and Policy SP18 Key Area Strategy – Two Waters

The LEP welcomes the focus the ESG gives to this area, and the opportunities for employment space along the A414/A41 junction, with investment in major transportation infrastructure including a multi modal interchange being the key driver to future investment.

#### 23.91 - 23.94 and Policy SP19 Key Area Strategy – Maylands Business Park

The LEP supports this, and welcomes the policies that pioneer the green economy, embed sustainable development through the use of low carbon materials, deliver sustainable energy infrastructure, create opportunities for the circular economy and for localised supply chains, and the piloting of zero carbon transportation innovations and smart construction (the LEP would however welcome the definition 'smart construction' in place of 'modern methods of construction').

#### 23.114 – 23.115 and BK01 in Policy SP20 Berkhamsted Employment

Whilst it might have been desirable to create significant additional employment opportunities within Berkhamsted the LEP acknowledges that there are other better opportunities in the borough and would not wish to raise any concerns.

#### 23.148 – 23.149 and TR01 in Policy SP23 Tring Employment

The LEP accepts the justification for the loss of the Akeman Business Park and welcomes the proposed creation of a 5.4 ha new employment site within the Dursley Farm proposed major extension.

23.221 - 23.222 CY01 and CY02 in Policy SP29. Extension to Bovingdon Brickworks and Bourne End Mills The LEP supports these designations.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12036
<b>Person ID</b>	1269358

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Tim Duggleby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director Redevelopment Programme West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	1269359
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Tom Rudd
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	BDP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Trust recognises the important role that surplus land on the Hemel Hempstead Hospital site could play in the Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy, in particular the development of Hemel Hempstead Town Centre, and supports identification of the site as a key growth area on page 210 of the Emerging Strategy for Growth.</p> <p>The Trust is currently developing a business case to support its strategic intent to redevelop the current hospital site as a specialist centre for the provision of planned medicine. Inclusion within Phase 1 of the Government's Health Infrastructure Plan provides the opportunity to secure funding in order to deliver the redevelopment during the period 2022—2025.</p> <p>At this stage of the process the Trust recognises the importance of releasing surplus land in order to meet the aspirations identified for Growth Area HH03 (Hospital Site). However, as discussed further in response to Question 5 below, the Trust will only be a position to confirm the size and location of land available following approval of its Outline Business Case, expected to be in late 2021.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12178
<b>Person ID</b>	1269448
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Mardell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Concerns that too much housing happening in Hemel Hempstead. Roads and parking already at capacity.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12351
<b>Person ID</b>	1269489
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE HILL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12458
<b>Person ID</b>	1269510
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Iredale
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Planning and Enabling Homes England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Homes England is the government's housing accelerator. We have the appetite, influence, expertise and resources to drive positive market change. By releasing more land to developers who want to make a difference, we're making possible the new homes England needs, helping to improve neighbourhoods and grow communities.</p> <p>Hemel Garden Communities is part of the Government's Locally led Garden Communities Programme and Homes England supports the Council's ambitions at Hemel Garden Communities in seeking to transform and grow Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>Homes England is already providing support to the Council to help progress the project towards delivery and an on-going commitment to quality and innovation is an important part of the Government's Garden Settlements initiative.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12608
<b>Person ID</b>	1269554
<b>Full Name</b>	Ellen Satchwell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Sustainable Development Lead Advisor - Thames Solent Team Natural England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Delivery Strategies</b></p> <p><b>Policy SP14 – Delivering Hemel Garden Communities</b></p> <p>As the main Policy for the Garden Town, we recommend addition to <i>SP14</i> to require all associated development to conserve the biodiversity on site and provide biodiversity net gain through multifunctional green infrastructure. This is supported within the NPPF (paras. 170, 175 (d). and will bring the Policy in line with <i>Policy DM30</i>.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12631
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>42612</p> <p>Frogmore Road Industrial Estate Frogmore Road Hemel (Approved)</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12743
<b>Person ID</b>	1250257

<b>Full Name</b>	Kate Harwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Gardens Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Development of Hemel Hempstead</b></p> <p>Although the Draft Plan states in its Mission Statement (23.11) that Garden City Principles will be followed in development plans, the expansion of Hemel Hempstead as proposed is against both Garden City Principles and against the New Town Principles laid out by Jellicoe and others. These require communities to be within easy reach of green open space for health and recreation. In the New Towns including Hemel, this was achieved by having discrete neighbourhoods separated from each other by green open space.</p> <p>HH01, HH02, HH05, HH22 destroy those principles by building on the open land at present available to residents of the communities adjacent to the proposed development areas.</p> <p>The heritage of the 20th century is increasingly being recognised, including addition of 20th century parks and gardens to the HE Register. Dacorum's 20th century heritage as one of the first New Towns should be conserved and enhanced in line with NPPF Chapter 16.</p> <p>The proposed employment development area west of the M1 should have policies to control buildings' height and lighting. The Registered Park and Listed mansion of Gorhambury lies to the east of the M1 and the setting could be harmed by ill-considered proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12750
<b>Person ID</b>	1250256
<b>Full Name</b>	Herts Gardens Trust
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Herts Gardens Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Development of Hemel Hempstead</b> <p>Although the Draft Plan states in its Mission Statement (23.11) that Garden City Principles will be followed in development plans, the expansion of Hemel Hempstead as proposed is against both Garden City Principles and against the New Town Principles laid out by Jellicoe and others. These require communities to be within easy reach of green open space for health and recreation. In the New Towns including Hemel, this was achieved by having discrete neighbourhoods separated from each other by green open space.</p> <p>HH01, HH02, HH05, HH22 destroy those principles by building on the open land at present available to residents of the communities adjacent to the proposed development areas.</p> <p>The heritage of the 20th century is increasingly being recognised, including addition of 20th century parks and gardens to the HE Register. Dacorum's 20th century heritage as one of the first New Towns should be conserved and enhanced in line with NPPF Chapter 16.</p> <p>The proposed employment development area west of the M1 should have policies to control buildings' height and lighting. The Registered Park and Listed mansion of Gorhambury lies to the east of the M1 and the setting could be harmed by ill-considered proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12789
<b>Person ID</b>	1269630
<b>Full Name</b>	Christopher Lyne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	That you want Hemel to have a vibrant town centre is of course good. However, have you thought through the wider post-pandemic and post-Brexit trends that are clearly starting to emerge?

Specifically, the lack of any cultural venue (thank you, Borough Council) will not help attract people into the town. Your plan for a retail-led development of the former Market Square in Hemel is risky and blind to currently changing retail trends. You cannot really want a litter-strewn take-away paradise by the water gardens, can you?

Please stop and think through the provision of cycle lanes and pedestrian routes. That on Station Road just has not worked and is hazardous to both cyclists and those on foot. The lessons from that need learning before setting future policy.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12862

**Person ID** 1269661

**Full Name** Ray Guirguis

**Organisation Details** OSD Healthcare

**Agent ID** 1269662

**Agent Full Name** Nick Baker

**Agent Organisation** Planning Director  
Lichfields

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** On behalf of our client, OSD Healthcare (OSD), we enclose representations to the above (Regulation 18) consultation. These representations have been prepared with regard to relevant policy in the National Planning Policy Framework, including the 'soundness' test at paragraph 35. Where relevant we have provided references to these policies below. For ease of reference, we have also identified the consultation questions in the enclosed form which our comments address.

**Introduction**

OSD operates the One Stop Doctors healthcare facility on Boundary Way, Hemel Hempstead (the OSD site). The site lies within the Maylands Business Park (draft Policy SP19) and is within the associated General Employment Area designation (Policy DMXX – presumed DM16) on the Policies Map which forms part of the draft plan.

OSD is an innovative private hospital which provides a range of primary and secondary care services including diagnostic imaging, consultant services and day case surgical procedures. These services are provided within their purpose-built facility which has been installed with the latest medical equipment and technologies and is open to patients 365 days a

year. It is evident that COVID-19 has had a huge impact on frontline NHS services; and OSD has been helping to alleviate some pressure on NHS waiting lists for diagnostics and outpatient services in the community under contractual agreements with their neighbouring Trusts. However, OSD is limited in the capacity in which they can assist with some procedures as they lack the ability to keep patients in the facility for overnight care, due to the Health and Safety Executive's (HSE) Consultation Zones surrounding the Buncefield Oil Terminal "advising against" a medical use which provides overnight accommodation.

OSD is keen to work with Dacorum Borough Council (DBC), welcomes the direction of the emerging Local Plan and considers that this emerging document represents a positive step for planning in Dacorum. Our observations and comments are provided within this context, which include the identification of some areas of the emerging Plan that we suggest should be amended to ensure that the emerging Plan is found sound at Examination.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12864

**Person ID** 1269661

**Full Name** Ray Guirguis

**Organisation Details** OSD Healthcare

**Agent ID** 1269662

**Agent Full Name** Nick Baker

**Agent Organisation** Planning Director  
Lichfields

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

*Policy SP15 – Delivering Growth in Hemel Hempstead*

Although OSD supports the growth aspirations of this Policy, it is considered that the growth and renewal areas (outlined in Tables 32 and 33) will be restricted by HSE Consultation Zones in their current, outdated state. OSD requests that Dacorum, as the Hazardous Substances Authority for the Buncefield site, pro- actively engage with the operators of the Buncefield site to potentially reduce the scope of the existing Hazardous Substances Consent in order to enable much-needed business and housing development around the site.

*Policy SP19 – Maylands Business Park*

OSD supports draft Policy SP19 in principle and its objective of securing the Maylands Business Park's position as a key employment centre for the wider South West Herts area. OSD also supports the aspiration to maximise integration of Maylands with the Herts IQ Enterprise Zone to the east. However, it is unclear how this will be achieved in the current context of the HSE Consultation Zones surrounding the Buncefield Oil Terminal, especially as neither the Policy nor the accompanying text make reference to the Terminal or the constraints it presents.

We note that the Zones do not appear to clearly relate to the current installation (storage tanks). The area which was the focus for the explosion and fires in 2005 appears cleared and grassed on current aerial mapping, however there still appears to be an allowance for this area in the Consultation Zone. Therefore, for the benefit of the wider Maylands area, we request a review of both the quantum of the hazardous substance and where it is installed on the site as part of the Local Plan preparation process.

We note that adopted Local Plan Policy CS34 states that an East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan (AAP) would provide further guidance on how the Business Park would function alongside Buncefield, but this AAP appears to have been abandoned after an Issues and Options consultation in June 2009. OSD consider that important benefits of this AAP and its preparation process remain valid but have not been picked up in this draft Local Plan, in particular the proposed possible reconfiguration of the Buncefield facility which would assist the Maylands Business Park. OSD requests that this is considered, as Dacorum BC is the Hazardous Substances Authority responsible for the Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC). It is acknowledged by OSD that the operator of Buncefield requires some flexibility in the operation of their HSC, however seeking to safeguard the potential to store more hazardous materials at the site should not come at the detriment of economic development and other business activities in the surrounding area.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12883

**Person ID** 1269665

**Full Name** Mr Martin Hicks

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Policy SP15 - Delivering Growth in Hemel Hempstead Growth Area HH12 proposes development and POS. There will be no room for any meaningful POS on this area of what remains historic common land. The diagram of key development in Two Waters is also misleading, showing Open Space where there isn't - between the canal and the Bulbourne; it is a restaurant, old nursery site and new multistorey development. The impression that this will be retained as open space is therefore wrong and misleading. Loss of this land will isolate and fragment the river corridor even further at this point and in this respect Policy SP18 is therefore not sustainable.</p> <p>H21 West Hemel Hempstead. The extension to Shrub Hill Common is supported. Where is this to be? The development proposals will also effectively isolate the LNR ecologically. Consequently, its long-term viability is threatened and consequently, the proposals are not sustainable.</p> <p>H22 Marchmont Farm. The development will essentially isolate Howe Grove and is therefore not sustainable.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13088
<b>Person ID</b>	1264779
<b>Full Name</b>	James Froggatt
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Affordability and Quality of housing</p> <p>My opinion is that there has not been one decent house built in Hemel Hempstead for the last 50 years. This is because the only parameter which had truly been considered is the profit margin of the builders constructing the houses or flats. It is there important that any new housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is made of durable, good quality materials with useful life of at least 200 years</li> <li>• is sufficiently large with 40 cubic metres per person</li> <li>• has high ceilings of at least 9 feet or 3 metres; and</li> <li>• is serviced with adequate parking of one car per expected adult and child of driving age</li> </ul> <p>the margins of the builders must be strictly controlled with clawback by the council and severe penalties for shoddy building and strict remediation clauses to make things right.</p>



The current Dacorum Council definition of “affordable” is out of the reach of most Hemel residents and a significant number of low wage earners will still not be able to afford their own home. I would request that the affordability criteria are reviewed and a further consultation be carried out on this.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13091

**Person ID** 1264779

**Full Name** James Froggatt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

Preservation of the Green Belt

I am opposed to building and houses/buildings on the Green Belt.

The assertion that there is not sufficient Brown field sites to build on is in my view incorrect. It may be cheaper and easier to build on green field sites rather than redevelop brown field sites but the assertion is borne of a lack of imagination, not reality.

Apart from the town centre (and even here consideration should be given to incorporating natural green spaces) the housing developments in Two Waters, Hemel Garden communities and the rest of Hemel Hempstead should not go ahead.

Instead these areas should be converted to managed nature reserves, forests and orchards for the enjoyment of residents. The planting and creation of new trees would be central to this policy.

The homes should be built in areas earmarked for new employment and empty retails sites including the still born M1 retail site and other sites of which there should be many with the onset of Covid and internet shopping.

I feel that the town planners have not grasped the permanent shift from Bricks and Mortar retail to online which requires much fewer retail sites in Hemel Hempstead.

Also there appears from the document to be no consideration of the renovation, further development and renovation of the existing industrial areas around Cupid Green, between Maylands Avenue and the M1; and the area around the Buncefield Oil Terminal. Most of these buildings are old and not fit for purpose and need redeveloping which would lead to an economic regeneration.

Again, we should use the sites we already have and put in a facility for new tech companies. I do not see this anywhere in the plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13094

**Person ID** 1264779

**Full Name** James Froggatt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** A possible Solution Doughnut living.  
To build the required number of homes in the plan in Hemel Hempstead and not use green space will require building good homes on top of one another in a series of storeys.  
Homes should be built around a green space of about two football pitches. Think of Wembley Stadium but with houses instead of seats for spectators.  
There will be car parking in the basement, amenities (shops Gyms, meeting halls religious places and anything else required) on the ground and possibly first floors.  
Above this, will be the homes. I do not have in mind brutalist tower blocks here but rather penthouses – spacious, well appointed and with strong sound proofing. These can go up multiple storeys and this configuration should easily accommodate the 11,000 homes required for Hemel Hempstead.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13095

**Person ID** 1264779

**Full Name** James Froggatt

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>My conclusion is that with a little imagination and a change of approach. Hemel Hempstead can get the housing it needs without the sacrifice of the surrounding and vital Green Belt.</p> <p>Building vertically is the solution rather than horizontally.</p> <p>There should be a concentration and rebuilding of retail and commercial buildings and the spare space left should be efficiently utilised.</p> <p>Amenities such as Fitness centres, Swimming pools. A new Hospital, library and police station should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Green belt land which would be built on should be reforested and turned into nature reserves.</p> <p>There is a chance to pioneer a new and better way of living and I ask the council to grasp this opportunity.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13189
<b>Person ID</b>	1265149
<b>Full Name</b>	David Lillywhite
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a resident of Dacorum as part of my personal submission regarding the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) I would like to fully endorse all the comments and suggestions made in the following report (attached) entitled:

**'Healthy Hemel - planning interventions for local climate action and well being' document dated 19th February 2021 and compiled by my good friend Mr Tim Hagyard MRTPI.**

These planning ideas for Hemel Hempstead seek to enhance the experience of the town; they are unconstrained by conventional wisdom of what is possible and allow this particular planner to dream a little. Three key questions are posed

- What if our well-being were the overriding aim of our plan- making?
- What if planning were fully aligned with urgent action on climate goals?
- What if planning were based on the priorities of actively engaged citizens?

*Healthy Hemel* is a series of proposals to address these questions. For a happier, greener alternative vision for Dacorum's Principal Town; ideas that will help to inform the future Dacorum Local Plan.

The '*Emerging Strategy for Growth*' and the '*Hemel Garden Community*' focus heavily on 'horizontal growth', edge of town dispersal into open countryside; as a spatial strategy it is not compact, doesn't prioritise regenerative place-making or align with climate action.

*Healthy Hemel* aims to channel the dynamic of development within the existing urban fabric, renewing and reimagining its existing neighbourhoods, the town centre and boosting the community and social resilience of the town.

[SEE EXTENT OF HEMEL GARDEN COMMUNITIES (PAGE 3) OF THE ATTACHED PDF]

To prioritise well-being planning, integrated with transport planning, needs to address four major life-harming issues

- 1 Air pollution - a major cause of which is petrol and diesel engines
- 2 Carbon emissions from petrol and diesel vehicles, now the UK's main contributor to climate change
- 3 Sedentary lifestyles – compounded by car dependent environments
- 4 Social inequality –the impacts of Covid-19 on poorer communities brought our social, economic and environmental inequalities into stark relief

We need to find sustainable ways of living but also regeneration; to correct for past unhealthy and unsustainable patterns. We need to heal, to restore our health and the damage caused to the natural world.

At its heart '*Healthy Hemel*' is a vision for people's, especially childrens', well-being; enabled by sustainable movement, green infrastructure, collaborative design and a focus on social and economic needs. Planners, architects, urban designers and policymakers now have a substantial body of evidence<sup>1</sup> that show what constitutes quality in place. For instance, all of the following elements support well-being and happiness

- greenness,
- mix of uses,
- low levels of traffic,
- walkability,
- bikeability,
- compact and coherent patterns of development,
- public transport connectivity

There is broad agreement that our decision-making, including current planning and transport systems, has not consistently delivered such successful places, even while our understanding of what makes for quality and excellence in urban design has increased.

In 2019, the UK Parliament declared a Climate Emergency; this and the experiences of the Covid-19 pandemic make 2021 a time to rethink and reform. We can see several campaigns such as #BuildBackBetter #GreenNew Deal #PlanTheWorldWeWant. Dacorum declared a Climate Emergency in Summer 2019; but the 'Emerging Strategy for Growth' seems to pre-date both this and the pandemic. It is driven by a familiar but narrow concept of 'growth' and a stress on questionable top-down housing numbers.

**Included files**

[Healthy Hemel - Final - 19 Feb 2021.pdf](#)

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS13385

**Person ID**

1270226

**Full Name**

Mr SAM W

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment**

I have lived in [ADDRESS REDACTED] East Adeyfield Dacorum for almost 30 years. I am constantly shocked at how many trees that have been removed or cut. Trees improve air quality, improve mental health and ease flooding. My biggest issue is there is not enough green space in my area, it has been constantly removed and used for other purposes. I would like to see some natural green 'wildlife suitable' space allocated in the area bordered by Maylands Ave, Breakspear Way, Boundary Way, Cherry Trees Lane and Swallowdale Lane. There is one small area shown as 'open-space' on Buncefield Lane on page 9 of 'Summary for Local Plan' – this is mostly a cemetery – not somewhere I would choose to go. I believe there is a very small area to walk a dog but I am told by dog walkers it isn't big enough and they don't use it.

Due to the latest removal of wildlife space in the area described above (due to the Winvic warehouse development), we have now lost the owls and bats that used to live here. I could hear the owls at night and now I cannot and I saw the

bats every year in my back garden and now they no longer come. Your proposed building is overly cramped with no green space allocated for this area.

I am also against any building on areas so close as you are showing, next to the M1, leaving virtually zero space for nature to retreat into. Please leave a larger area for them to live in. I am against building on the green belt. I am against the creation of employment space in the countryside, please leave it for nature.

Please, please consider the Covid pandemic and how important nature really is. Have we learnt nothing?

We should be looking at finding ways to reduce human population instead of constantly looking to increase housing and consequently, services. I f we don't do this then nature will find a way to enforce it on us.

I really hope that the government does change things so that nature will play a larger part in any further developments as I believe it is critical to our survival. We must do more for nature.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13519

**Person ID** 1270286

**Full Name** TAMZIN PHILLIPS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Here are a few ideas for the town after reading about the plan for Hemel.  
Connecting communities  
Pathways

Different walkways could be created around and across the town. These could be circular routes or ones that link areas. As we've all been in lockdown people have rediscovered their local areas more. Could more interconnecting pathways be established and enhanced to highlight routes for exercise and recreation. There are many existing pathways that could potentially be used already. Maps could be created to show the different routes.

Local community centres for social engagements and activities There are minimal events socially as a community now the pavilion has gone. Could more be made of the local community centres to encourage orchestras, art exhibitions etc Gadebridge Park could also be used as a summer venue for concerts in the park.

Historical connection

The Bury at one end of Gadebridge Park could be used as a museum of Hemel and the surrounding areas. There is so much hidden history that could be displayed. A cafe could also be included.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13681

**Person ID** 1270353

**Full Name** Kevin Hammersley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Having just looked at the proposed planning for the development of housing in Hemel Hempstead for around 500+ dwellings it raises a few concerns.

I do understand the need for housing and also understand there is only so much brown field land that can be used, but my concerns are for the infrastructure that is also needed.

I believe that Dacorum has a population of around 150.000, we have no hospital, our water supply is limited , our roads are glogged and our schools and GP surgerys full.

Could I please have these points been raised, and are they being taken on board if they have?

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13686
<b>Person ID</b>	1207133
<b>Full Name</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Community Delivery Strategy, including policy SP16 Object. pp.191-220</p> <p>The CCB welcomes the fact that a strategic vision and approach has been taken with regard to the expansion and regeneration of Hemel Hempstead, in particular that neighbouring St Albans Council have been positively engaged with its interest in adjoining land. Despite this, the founder of the Garden City movement, Ebenezer Howard, would be spinning in his grave, since he stated that a garden city that expanded into its surrounding Green Belt would, in his eyes, no longer be worthy of the name – a principle that has been forgotten by the TCPA as current custodians of the “Garden City Principles”.</p> <p>The CCB is, however, deeply concerned that this section of the plan fails to mention the Chilterns AONB specifically, despite the many parts of the town’s expansion that extend into the setting of the AONB, including right up to its boundaries. The extent of the AONB is not even shown on the “key developments” maps on pp.193 and 206. This is a serious omission and could be seen to demonstrate evidence that the Delivery Strategy has not taken due account of the duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.</p> <p>The CCB specifically objects to policy SP16 which fails to renotes that the site of the Amaravati Monastery is located in the Chilterns AONB, and the policy should therefore include a reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14095
<b>Person ID</b>	1269147
<b>Full Name</b>	TIM HAGYARD



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Healthy Hemel - Final - 19 Feb 2021.pdf (1)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14154
<b>Person ID</b>	1163439
<b>Full Name</b>	Lindy Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I note the several comments throughout the Draft Plan that underpin the decision to distribute the housing allocations in the manner set out. This will result in very substantial additions to both the major settlements of Berkhamsted and Tring with extensive new releases of Green Belt to be designated as 'Growth Areas'. Although cogently set out in the Plan, neither towns' growth will be organic nor 'sustainable' – as local employment opportunities at the scale to match resident numbers does not exist and will lead to additional out-commuting.</p> <p>Far better to locate new dwellings at scale closer to centres of industry and hence employment. For Dacorum, industry is concentrated in Maylands and the surrounding area.</p> <p>I note the proposals for Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities – the land released for Growth Area HH01 (Phase 1) to be undertaken 2021 -2038 and the Growth Area HH02 – North Hemel (Phase 2) recorded as being released from</p>

Green Belt on adoption of the Plan but safeguarded for 2038 – 2050: this area is designated for around 4,000 homes etc.

I fail to be convinced that Berkhamsted and Tring should be developed to the extent proposed for 2021-2038: the capacity to absorb the growth of over 24% and 50% sustainably is questionable. Appending HH01 and HH02 to the existing urban network is likely to prove to be the more sustainable solution.

We request the Borough:

1. Reconsider the allocations [which in any case I dispute as being justified see Q 7], and defer the release of BK01 etc. from the 2021 – 2038 plan
2. Re phase the implementation of HH02 to bring forward to 2021 – 2038

This would bring forward some 4,000 homes which will be better located for employment opportunities.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14375

**Person ID** 1270640

**Full Name** Geoffrey Llewellyn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** Please see what BRAG have said about windfall numbers.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14421

**Person ID** 1270662

**Full Name** MAX GOODE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>LCR and NR note the reference to draft allocation HH08 within draft Paragraph 23.36 and is generally supportive of this, although considers that this should be led by demand for this type of floorspace at the time a planning application is submitted, especially in light of the current situation with COVID-19 and remote working.</p> <p>At a general level, we consider further reference should be made to the importance of the delivery of the multi-modal transport interchange identified for delivery at draft Allocation HH08. This is mentioned in passing between draft Paragraphs 23.20 and 23.60 but its importance to the wider development aspirations of Dacorum is not considered to be clear.</p> <p>LCR and NR consider that Table 32 should reflect the suggested amendments to the wording of draft Allocation HH08 included within these Representations.</p> <p>LCR and NR support draft Policy SP18 (Two Waters Opportunity Area) and consider there is opportunity to make clear that landmark 'tall buildings' would be appropriate, subject to masterplanning, within Growth Areas within Opportunity Areas</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14427
<b>Person ID</b>	1270664
<b>Full Name</b>	ASHLEY COLLINS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Our Client is strongly supportive of the proposed Two Waters Opportunity Area and agrees that this area is one of the most sustainable locations within the borough and the potential for redevelopment of underutilised and inefficient sites should be maximised.</p> <p>additional housing to meet the Borough need. Paragraph 23.84 recognises that the area is dominated by industrial land and large retail units which detract from the character of the area and yet no consideration has been given to these existing retail sites, of which a majority are located in out of the town centre. Questions also need to be answered whether the retail units are required at all given the turbulent retail market in the short, medium and longer term; and/or whether they would be better positioned elsewhere in the area, where they do not occupy such prominent and sustainable sites.</p> <p>Our Client's site, for example, is located in an optimum location for housing, with a canal frontage, adjacent to the train station, walking distance to the centre of and sub-regional centre of Hemel Hempstead, and in close proximity to Heath Park and a number of local facilities such as schools, doctors surgeries etc. If redeveloped for housing, this site could deliver upwards of 400 units making a meaningful contribution to the housing supply whilst also supporting the existing Local Centre by bringing a new residential community to a highly sustainable location.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">AA8994 - Apsley Retail Park_Rep Update Ir.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14562
<b>Person ID</b>	1270698
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Elizabeth Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This proposal appears to have been formulated without consultation with local communities, which is contrary to government guidelines, and I note that the Crown Estate is 'a significant stakeholder as a major landowner'. Paragraph 23.8 describes this proposal as 'greenfield development' but fails to mention that is proposed for land which is currently designated as Green Belt and it would lie immediately adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. As such the proposal does not</p>

comply with national policy in respect of the protection of land lying in both designations, or proposed NPPF policy and existing Chiltern Conservation Board policy regarding the setting of the AONB.

It is inappropriate for the Crown Estate to profit from development which is contrary to national policy.

Paragraph 23.8 proposes that the Hemel Garden Communities Spatial Vision will 'act as a major catalyst for the transformation of the town'. I have set out already some reasons why this proposal does not conform with statutory requirements concerning climate change mitigation, national and Chiltern Conservation Board policy concerning the Green Belt and the Chilterns AONB and NPPF policies regarding sustainable development. There may be no water available before the very end of the 2030s to supply this area and the feasibility of providing appropriate wastewater infrastructure, including expansion of receiving waste water treatment works, is a major uncertainty and could be prohibitive on cost grounds. This is set out clearly on page 67 of the Water Cycle Study Scoping Study, referring to Hemel Hempstead, as follows (this 2010 Study refers to the growth scenarios in the then draft regional plan but the growth levels proposed in Scenario 2 are similar to those in this Strategy):

Both scenarios have the potential to significantly increase the risk of sewer flooding throughout the existing settlement, especially the potential growth sites to the northeast and northwest. TWU will need to assess the possibility of trunk main flooding further down the catchment. The total increase of flows throughout the catchment is likely to increase flood risk downstream of the Maple Lodge WwTW discharge. SC1/2: The sensitive nature of the habitats downstream of the Maple Lodge WwTW may constrain growth, particularly Scenario 2 levels, as the existing Maple Lodge WwTW process is operating at BAT regarding nutrients.

Major constraint to development, requiring extensive infrastructure improvements to allow development (possible showstopper at this stage but may be reclassified following further investigation).

I have major concerns about the plan on page 193 of the Strategy, showing the Key Developments in the whole of Hemel Hempstead, and these concerns apply to the other plans in this chapter and elsewhere in the Strategy referring to delivery strategies in other locations. The plans are deficient in a number of respects: there is no scale and neither the Green Belt nor the Chilterns AONB are shown.

Furthermore the Leighton Buzzard Road is labelled as the A4146. All of the maps in the Draft Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan showing proposals for Hemel Hempstead infrastructure are similarly misleading, such as Map 7 before paragraph 18.1. The road adjoining the western edge of the proposed Hemel Garden Communities area is labelled as an A road (to Leighton Buzzard). It was actually downgraded to a B road (the B440) some years ago.

The proposed new road around the north side of Hemel Hempstead, through the proposed Garden Communities, would disgorge its westbound traffic onto the B440 and thereafter it is unclear what would happen to this traffic. Just to the north of the junction are two Grade II listed bridges over the River Gade at Water End, one of which has a 7.5 tonne weight restriction and single-line working. Currently the single-line working on the northern bridge means that long northbound traffic queues form at peak periods to cross the bridge, and rat running to avoid these queues is common. Other options for traffic to avoid this bridge, apart from turning south into the town centre, are all narrow unclassified rural lanes, mostly running into or adjacent to the AONB, **some only single width**, serving and running through the middle of small rural settlements.

The impact of the traffic leaving the western end of the Hemel Garden Communities, where 20,000 homes are proposed to be built by 2050, especially as it is likely that most of that traffic would be trying to go north or west, **would be massive and completely unacceptable**. It would appear that the proposals for the development of this area, and this road, have been put together as a desk-based exercise in the belief that the Leighton Buzzard Road is an A class road. The reality of the local road network on this side of Hemel Hempstead should be studied fully and in detail on the ground, to include proper consultation with the local communities which would be hugely impacted by this proposal. There is literally no room in many of the villages located along these routes for any road widening and I suggest that for this reason alone the whole Garden Communities proposal should be scrapped.

The current restrictions on the northern bridge on the B440 at Water End including the 7.5 tonnes limit mean that lorries at present are travelling from the Leighton Buzzard Road into Berkhamsted to try to access the A41. Traffic heading west from the Hemel Garden Communities would also end up going down into Berkhamsted by means of one of the steep and narrow routes into the town, which have restricted width crossings of the railway, before arriving at the town centre which is already over-burdened with

traffic. This is also unacceptable and it would appear that no thought at all has been given to the consequences on Berkhamsted of the Hemel Garden Communities proposal and its proposed road.

Furthermore, the transport proposals elsewhere within Hemel Hempstead will also have serious consequences for Berkhamsted, the AONB and the rural areas. In particular the proposal to downgrade the dualled A414 between the A41 and the M1 junction 8 to accommodate the proposed improved public transport and active travel connections is alarming. The proposed new road through the Hemel Garden Communities in northern Hemel Hempstead is predicted in the Strategy to be used by traffic from Tring and Berkhamsted accessing the M1 rather than, as at present, using the A41/A414 route through Hemel Hempstead. This would be an appalling outcome for Berkhamsted, the AONB and the rural areas for the reasons explained already.

In summarising the main findings of its 2020 report *Garden Villages and Garden Towns: Visions and Reality*, the organisation Transport for New Homes said:

*Garden Communities are envisaged as sociable, green communities, each with a centre that is easily walked to and a transport system built for sustainability. Our new report found that the reality threatens to be very different. Transport for New Homes examined plans for 20 Garden Communities in detail, as well as the funding and policy landscape behind them, and found that – in their current form – they will generate high levels of traffic by condemning their residents to car-dependent lifestyles. Most are planned in the wrong locations, far from town centres and rail stations. They lack local facilities and their streets are designed around car use. Funding for walking, cycling and public transport is missing.*

*Just the 20 Garden Communities that we looked at will create up to 200,000 car-dependent households. Non-driving residents will have to walk up to seven miles to access the nearest town centre or a railway station. Unless this picture improves, Garden Communities will be completely at odds with the visions presented, worsening climate change and failing their residents.*

*Sustainable transport is vital to tackling the climate crisis. Walking and cycling in particular have come to prominence during the health crisis, as have the benefits of living more locally. But the housing that we are planning threatens to take us in the opposite direction, locking us into car-dependent lifestyles for decades to come.*

<https://www.transportfornewhomes.org.uk/the-project/garden-villages-and-garden-towns/>

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14590

**Person ID** 1270707

**Full Name** Ms Debbie Wilson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having lived in this town my entire life I have witnessed the removal and deconstruction of practically all of the best adult/family entertainment venues in this town - the Pavillion, countless pubs that hosted live music as well as social clubs, nightclubs, bars, arcades, swimming centres, bowling, pool halls, Quasar, and many others. To compound this, the population has grown significantly already and the residents are feeling it.</p> <p>Not planning to provide social activities for residents is highly detrimental to people's mental, physical and social health. Planning to increase the population of the borough by an additional 50,000+ people without planning for these improvements will compound this issue even further.</p> <p>Residents need to be provided with a wide variety of options for things to do. There's only so many times you can go for a meal and head to the cinema.</p> <p>High streets should no longer be focused purely on shopping, which is being driven out by online shopping, and instead should offer a range of entertainment venues for residents. This will provide jobs and bring high streets to life. Entertainment venues should be suitably sized. The Old Town Hall has a capacity of around 100 people. This is not suitable to cater for a growing town which will soon have a population to rival cities. Entertainment venues can cater for local groups such as amateur dramatics, local music festivals, open mic nights and then have the potential to draw in larger acts in terms of comedians, musicians and bands, theatre productions, etc.</p> <p>After COVID, people will be craving and valuing these facilities more than ever before.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14844
<b>Person ID</b>	325470
<b>Full Name</b>	Gardener Family Trust
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Gardener Family Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270807
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Alistair Brodie



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Henry H Bletsoe & Son LLP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please see the comments set out in the following section, dealing with Question 5.</p> <p>We note the ambitious plans to work with St Albans City &amp; District Council, in the delivery of over 10,000 new homes, as part of a new Garden Town. Whilst this is commendable, the scale of development is very large and in part reliant upon the provision of major new infrastructure and a close working relationship between two neighbouring, planning authorities. From my early career working at Telford Development Corporation I am well aware of the long lead in times associated with development on this scale. It is a complicated and time consuming process frequently involving differences of opinion between two local government bodies. In Telford there was a constant tension between Telford Development Corporation, as the delivery vehicle and Wrekin District Council, as the planning authority.</p> <p>I have also been involved recently, in development to the north of Houghton Regis where substantial housing development is now beginning to take shape, largely designed to meet the housing needs of Luton Borough Council, but on land which falls within the control of Central Bedfordshire Council.</p> <p>The whole process has been hugely delayed as a result of differences of opinion between the two authorities, which eventually ended up being contested in the courts.</p> <p>Therefore, with the best will in the world, and whilst I commend the ambitions set out in the housing delivery strategies, I must express concern over the ability of two independent planning authorities, to embrace the Hemel Garden Communities principle and positively work through a Memorandum of Understanding in order to coordinate the policies required between the two bodies.</p> <p>Given the long lead in time required to bring forward the scheme at HH21 for 1150 dwellings (which still does not currently have planning consent, after years of going through the local plan process and the planning application process) I am concerned that this large and complex scheme will not deliver the required housing numbers, within the anticipated timeframe. Smaller, more manageable schemes are easier and quicker to bring forward.</p> <p>In addition, the number of houses proposed on sites in Hemel Hempstead, is partly dependent upon the redevelopment of brown field sites. Again experience suggests considerable uncertainty must exist over when such sites will come forward for development and, in some instances, there must be a possibility that some sites will fail to come forward for redevelopment.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14907
<b>Person ID</b>	1270828

<b>Full Name</b>	Owen Ellander
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Property Development Greene King Brewing and Retailing Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270829
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mrs Helen Binns
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Walsingham Planning
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Land to the north of the Red Lion Public House, London Road, Hemel Hempstead should be included within the Two Waters Opportunity Area - see letter of representation from Walsingham Planning.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14976
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The supporting text recognises that there is a desire to improve cycling and walking routes along the River Gade but not the importance or the desire to improve the River itself here. We would like to see the River given greater prominence in the strategy, not just as a transport link but also for its flood risk, biodiversity and health benefits it brings to the town centre.

The Policy refers to sustainable energy and power infrastructure. We would like this expanded to include water infrastructure.

We would like to be consulted on the specific Development Briefs that is mentioned within your policy.

We are glad to see that the policy includes the protection and enhancements of waterways and key wildlife habitats. The area also has large flood risk issues which will need to be recognised and managed in this policy.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15046

**Person ID** 1250021

**Full Name** Hallam Land Management Ltd

**Organisation Details** Hallam Land Management Ltd

**Agent ID** 1265070

**Agent Full Name** Stacey Rawlings

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment** The inclusion of the Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Strategy within the DBLP to 2038 is not appropriate. The draft Plan seeks to allocate 1500 units as a first phase of a potential 11,000 dwelling mixed use development including land within St Albans District that is yet to be published in a new draft plan, consulted upon and examined. The MOU Mission Statement suggests HGC will comprise 11,000 new homes and 10,000 new jobs. This should be deleted as it is not capable of being examined through this plan.

The inclusion of the **Key Developments in the Whole of Hemel Hempstead** diagram at pg 193 is misleading and should also not form part of the draft Plan. The wider context and potential development areas beyond the DBC boundary are not available for scrutiny and examination.

For the areas within the DBC boundary, the full evidence base is not yet available for the proposed allocation for 1500 homes or the land to be removed and safeguarded from the Green Belt for up to 4,000 homes in this draft plan. The

Hemel Garden Communities Spatial Vision, Concept Masterplan and Transformation Plan are not available for review. Accordingly, draft **Policy SP14: Delivering Hemel Garden Communities** is not justified, supported or effective.

Draft **Policy SP15 – Delivering growth in Hemel Hempstead** is not effective or sound for the following two reasons:

- 1 It extends to the two North Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas. This suggests it includes the safeguarded land as well as the proposed allocation for this plan period. This is unclear and unjustified.
- 2 Reference to growth East of Hemel Hempstead within St Albans District should be deleted. This land is outwith the administrative area of Dacorum Borough and therefore beyond the remit of the draft Plan.

The housing delivery **Table 31 of draft Policy SP15** is not justified or properly evidenced. The subsection 2 includes Site HH02 (phase 2 of HGC) for 4,000 homes as part of an overall pot of 10,915 dwellings from the identified Growth Areas. Again, there is no consistency of approach. The delivery of the 4,000 homes is not required during this plan period and the Phase 2 land is not proposed for allocation. A separate policy dealing with ‘Safeguarded Land’ is required.

The **Key Developments in North Hemel Hempstead** diagram at pg 206 is also misleading and should be adapted/excluded.

Draft **Policy SP16 – North and East of Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas** also requires modifying to reflect the plan requirements.

Generally, the Council switches between ‘Growth Areas’ and ‘Strategic Allocations’ when defining growth locations in this section of the Plan. This is confusing and should be simplified to ensure the reader (and decision-taker applying the future plan policies for planning applications) are clear as to what constitutes a strategic allocation and what constitutes a housing allocation. Taking the Hemel example, the range of ‘strategic allocations’ includes sites for 10 dwellings up to 4000 dwellings.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15065

**Person ID** 1270849

**Full Name** Ms Jessica Lindfield

**Organisation Details** St William Homes LLP

**Agent ID** 210999

**Agent Full Name** Mr  
Martin  
Friend

**Agent Organisation** Director  
Vincent & Gorbing

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>DELIVERY STRATEGIES – HEMEL HEMPSTEAD</b></p> <p>St William support the overall development strategy for Hemel Hempstead. The scale of the development envisaged at Hemel Hempstead is clearly significant and the greenfield growth areas will clearly take some considerable time to come to fruition and will need close co-operation with the City and District of St Albans. It is clearly imperative to ensure that the plan does not fall foul of duty to co-operate requirements in this regard, and that the overall viability of the greenfield growth areas is fully tested.</p> <p>St William consider that the DESG should take a cautious approach to the timescale for the delivery of the growth areas, and ensure that the allocations within the built up area are encouraged to come forward quickly and in a way which maximises their potential.</p> <p>Policy SP15, which lists all of the allocations, should identify the yield from these sites as minimum rather than ‘around’, given that the overall housing requirement is expressed in this way. It is noted that in discussing specifically the Two Waters area, the DESG identifies the area as accommodating “a minimum of 1500 units plus windfall development” (para. 23.88). As highlighted above, it is considered that the overall amount of windfall development is likely to reduce in the future, emphasising the importance of optimising the yield from allocations within the Two Waters area, including the National Grid site.</p> <p>As noted above in respect of comments on the National Grid site allocation it is considered that the reference to “public open space” in Table 32 is not necessary and is potentially misleading in suggesting the provision of open space as a land use in its own right. The open space provision within the site will be guided by the other policies of the plan (particularly policy DM63).</p> <p><b>Two Waters Opportunity Area</b></p> <p>St William support the overall approach of policy SP18 – Two Waters Opportunity Area, including the recognition that this is one of the most sustainable locations in the Borough where higher density development will be supported.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15120
<b>Person ID</b>	1222814
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex MacGregor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Senior Planner Quod Ltd (ON BEHALF OF PIGEON INV MAN LTD)
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Pigeon Hemel Hempstead Ltd supports the HGC Spatial Vision that is set out on page 199 of the Local Plan. HGC provides the potential to provide a high quality new integrated community in a highly sustainable location that will support healthy lifestyles, biodiversity, climate resilience, environmental sustainability and the wellbeing of local communities. The cross-boundary collaborative approach with SADC and other delivery partners is also welcomed since this is considered essential to the effective delivery of the HGC Growth Areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, Policy SP16 recognises the importance of all growth areas that make up HGC and sets out strategic principles that the whole of the HGC should follow, including the growth areas to the North of Hemel Hempstead in DBC, and the growth areas to the east of Hemel Hempstead that lie within SADC. Pigeon Hemel Hempstead Ltd welcomes the strategic and collaborative approach that is being established across the whole HGC.</p> <p>However, for the same reasons as set out in the response to Question 2, Pigeon Hemel Hempstead Ltd does not support the safeguarding of land at North Hemel Growth Area (Phase 2) to deliver 4,000 post 2038 as proposed within Policy SP15.</p> <p>It is unclear what evidence DBC is using to justify preventing any development coming forward within this land until after 2038. DBC states in its Housing Topic Paper at para 7.35 that the delay is necessary to allow for necessary infrastructure to be delivered, but delaying an allocation by over 17 years to allow for infrastructure to be developed does not appear to be sufficiently justified based on current evidence. There is no information on phasing for HGC infrastructure currently provided in the IDP to justify the post 2038 delay. The detailed infrastructure requirements and associated phasing and delivery considerations remain subject to further assessment and discussion as part of the progression of the HGC Framework Plan and should not be pre-determined or unduly constrained. Even once this work is complete, it will be important that the Plan provides sufficient flexibility to enable this long-term scheme to be delivered whilst adapting to any changes in circumstance.</p> <p>Furthermore, as highlighted in our response to Question 2, housing and infrastructure need to be delivered together, therefore, artificially delaying Phase 2 may also further delay the provision of necessary infrastructure. Bringing forward development is much more likely to support the deliverability of the new community. The phasing of the North and East of Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas should be flexible to enable, rather than hold back delivery.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15295
<b>Person ID</b>	1161497
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Robert Sellwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Crown Estate
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Chapter 23 : Delivery Strategies</u></p> <p>The principles of the ‘Delivery Strategy’ for Hemel Hempstead are supported, but with the following caveats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Paragraph 23.23</b> : Elsewhere, North Hemel is referred to as delivering “<i>a minimum of 1,550 homes by 2038</i>”. The references should be consistent, using this figure. The post 2036 growth in the former St Albans Local Plan was split, 1,000 homes to the north of Redbourn Road (S6(iv)) and 200 to the south of the former S6(iii).</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 23.47</b> : Paragraph 23.47 gives an incorrect definition of the 60% mode share target. It defines it as a 60% “<i>change in modal share</i>” whereas the aspiration (as set out by the TCPA) is for a 60% modal share. Proposed revised wording is set out below which would then be consistent with PolicySP16 :</li> </ul> <p>“ – a 60% sustainable mode share for North and East of Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas and 40% sustainable mode share for the rest of the town – both targets to be achieved by 2050.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Paragraph 23.48</b> : In relation to Para 23.48, it is not yet determined at what stage the significant improvement to Junction 8 of the M1 will be required (ie. before or after the end of the plan period). Therefore, the first bullet point should not be a firm</li> <li>• <b>Paragraph 23.50</b> also refers to “<i>the transport corridor to the north of the town</i>”, although this is not listed in para 48.</li> </ul>

- **Paragraph 23.51** : TCE has seen no evidence to justify the proposal for three Secondary Schools across the whole of Hemel Garden Community. Two of these are proposed to be located in Phases 1 and 2 of the North Hemel Growth Area, whilst the third would be in the SADC part of

Policy SP14 : Delivering Hemel Garden Communities

As a major freeholder of land within the Garden Community, The Crown Estate (TCE) strongly welcomes and supports the proposal as a viable and deliverable allocation.

Policy SP15 : Delivering Growth in Hemel Hempstead

- **HH01 on page 201** : It is considered that the reference to provision of the Strategic Link corridor (part) should be replaced by: “*Safeguarding of land within HH01 for a Multi Modal Transport Corridor that would link Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road and be constructed in phases as land to the North of Hemel Hempstead is built out.*”. It would not be appropriate to require construction of the whole corridor until growth areas to the east of HH01, which fall outside this Local Plan period, are allocated and Safeguarding is envisaged in para 23.74.
- **(first bullet)** The capacity of Phase 1 should be referred to as “*a minimum of 1,550 homes*” to be consistent with other
- **(sixth bullet)** TCE has yet to see any evidence which justifies the need for a new Secondary School in association with a development of 1,550 dwellings in this initial phase.

HH02 on page 201

- **(third bullet)** It seems unnecessarily precise to refer to “*three local / neighbourhood centres*”, since this should be determined through the masterplan process
- **(fifth bullet)** TCE has yet to see any evidence which justifies the need for two Secondary Schools in the North Hemel Hempstead Growth Area.
- **Paragraph 23.70** : It is suggested that the reference in Para 23.70 to “*being easily accessed on foot*” should also include by cycle.



- **Paragraph 23.71** : This refers to improvements to Junction 8 of the M1 and a new strategic transport corridor from Hemel Hempstead Station to Maylands being delivered by North and East Hemel Growth Areas. The Junction 8 scheme will serve all development coming forward in Hemel Hempstead and therefore the reference should be to “*contributing to*” rather than “*delivering*”. This also applies to off-site It is also unclear what the HH station to Maylands new strategic corridor is, as it does not appear to be referred to elsewhere.
- **Paragraph 23.75** : This policy states that Phase 1 “*will deliver*” certain pieces of However, this should be amended to “*facilitate or contribute*”, which is consistent with Policy SP16(4). This is because Phase 1 cannot deliver (for example) the whole of the link road or the ‘figure of 8’ quietway.
- **Policy SP16 : North and East Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas**: In SP16(4), it is not clear what the reference to “60% modal share” actually relates

Transport Topic Paper

- (**paragraph 75**) TCE agree that this paragraph usefully summarises the masterplan issues surrounding the form, nature and alignment of the North Hemel Link
- TCE support the overall approach to examining options for developing the Transport Strategy within the Transport Topic Paper. TCE generally concurs with the long list of options although consider there may be others to also consider. TCE also generally concurs with the “Next Steps” set out at paragraph 9.31 and agree that a deliverable and robust set of interventions are needed that need to be derived from the long list of options available. For example, TCE does not consider that it has been determined from the work to date whether the M1 Junction 8 improvement would be needed within the Local Plan period to 2038. TCE looks forward to working with DBC and the other authorities in developing the strategy.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15466
<b>Person ID</b>	1271103
<b>Full Name</b>	GRAHAM RITCHIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	FAIRFAX STRATEGIC LAND (HEMEL) LTD
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	SEE ATTACHED RESP
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15568
<b>Person ID</b>	1271585
<b>Full Name</b>	Kim Harding
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Asset Protection Specialist Affinity Water Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Our investment plans are highly regulated and set on a 5 year cycle. Our funding is based on this. These plans can be seen in our Water Resources Management Plan (also attached). Site based infrastructure is funded by developers.</p> <p>The main issue for us in planning to supply water to new development is the uncertainty in implementation timeframes. We would like to see an <b>Integrated Water Management Statements</b> included as part of your Local Information Requirements (Validation). This would ensure that the developer approaches us in good time, and would go some way to help address any issues associated with having to supply developments at short notice.</p> <p>The performance of our network has been assessed under 2 different scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current demand – to establish the baseline</li> </ul>

- Future demand (including future developments in AW records and Dacorum sites listed in the table on slide 2&4). All developments are in place at the time specified.

All the assessed scenarios have been scaled to reflect peak summer demand conditions.

According to the simulation results:

- The demand increase due to **LP Reg 18 4 Dec - DRAFT LP Housing Growth Proposals** (domestic) will be approximately 5.45 MI/d (12,116 domestic units).
- The demand increase due to **LP Reg 18 8 Dec - DRAFT LP General Employment Areas** (only one site) will be approximately 0.12 MI/d.
- The pressures at the critical points in the network due to the new developments are such that major reinforcements in the network in the Dacorum area will be required. This normally means new pipelines although in some cases new pumping stations will also be required. There is sufficient water supply in the region. Transfer capacity and reservoirs balance would need to be studied.

All the proposed reinforcements will aim to recover the current level of service and the loss of capacity in the network due to the additional load imposed by all projected development.

Our current plan considers reinforcements to be installed in the following years, and the new infrastructure will be available for the initial housing planning that may be used to absorb some initial phases of total growth.

**However, the North Hemel is major development, and together with other big projects occurring in the area the overall scheme design and construction programme will depend on the location and phasing of these. This means our current plan may need to be reviewed due to the big increase of demand in the area. Any early information concerning this (phasing domestic/employment demand and industrial use) will help our planning.** This is subject to developers and customers reducing their PPC (*Per Capita Consumption*) according to our WRMP (*Water Resources Management Plan*) through the development of water-efficient buildings; and encouraging customers to save water.

Our WRMP can be viewed at the link below:

[https://www.affinitywater.co.uk/docs/Affinity\\_Water\\_Final\\_WRMP19\\_April\\_2020.pdf](https://www.affinitywater.co.uk/docs/Affinity_Water_Final_WRMP19_April_2020.pdf)

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15579
<b>Person ID</b>	1271579
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	BOYER PLANNING ON BEHALF OF W LAMB LTD
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We strongly support the aspirations of the Hemel Garden Communities and the four foundation pillars. The requirement to deliver a 60% modal shift (although not referred to in this section of the Plan) is clearly key in relation to these</li> </ul> <p>Local Plan Reg 18 Representations   Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We strongly support Policy SP14. The principles have been incorporated into the Vision Document and Illustrative Masterplan for Land at Shendish, contained in Appendix 2 and 3 of these</li> <li>We object to Policy SP15 as it does not make sufficient housing provision to meet the Borough's housing need in line with the standard method</li> <li>In the interests of the soundness of the Plan, it is recommended that the focus for the shortfall in housing numbers must be allocated to Hemel Hempstead as set out in section 4 and 5 of these representations, and the allocation of Land at Shendish would assist in meeting with this strategy, as the most sustainable site being proposed within the Borough. The other towns are already seeing significant levels of growth and any further allocations could lead to an imbalance and would not accord with the settlement hierarchy</li> <li>In the interests of the soundness of the Plan, it is recommended that Policy SP15 should be amended to include specific reference to Land at Shendish as a Growth</li> </ul>

--

## 23 Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

### Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS37
<b>Person ID</b>	1158931
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Juliet Chodzko
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the scale of this proposal, with particular reference to para. 23.99. At present Berkhamsted still retains much of the character of an ancient market town. If this development goes ahead it will become another urban sprawl. The large Green Belt areas are important for health, recreation and access to the wider countryside. The plan refers to public open spaces but these are too fragmented, and also to wildlife corridors but these are too small to be of much benefit. It is appreciated that more housing is required but not on this scale and without the essential supporting infrastructure. (address removed)</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS39
<b>Person ID</b>	741960
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs. Anne Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing in strong protest at the proposals put forward in the local plan for Dacorum. ONS figures do not support the large numbers of houses that the local plan is proposing. It is not acceptable for the Borough Council to proceed with plans to build on any green belt land.</p> <p>The proposals for the Northchurch area would inevitably affect Berkhamsted High Street and cause. huge congestion problems. Most of the streets leading from the A 4251 are narrow and increased usage of these side roads would cause enormous problems. There is insufficient infrastructure to cope: it is not reasonable or right to expect Berkhamsted to absorb the large numbers of proposed houses.</p> <p>I repeat. BERKHAMSTED CANNOT ABSORB MORE RESIDENTS ON THE SCALE PROPOSED FOR THE NEXT 18 YEARS.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS53
<b>Person ID</b>	1254476
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Moriarty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We wish to object strongly to the proposal to build 60 homes on the Lock Field site Bk07. Building houses here will create serious detriment to traffic on New Road which is already very dangerous given the narrow path between St Mary's school and Bridgewater Hill.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS61

<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Policy SP20/21</b> <b>23.107</b> with regards to further residential allocations that are proposed within the urban area shows Berkhamsted Civic Centre and land to the rear of High Street listed. This will remove a venue used for entertainment, plus the carpark for DBC workers vehicles. If so where are the replacement/ alternative sites that can be used? <b>23.131</b> around 1,000 homes (including provision for older people)are planned how many will be ARCH owned and will they be at social affordable rent
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS95
<b>Person ID</b>	1255447
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Sparrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I prefer this plan to significant development to the Bourne End side of the town.
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS112
<b>Person ID</b>	1255605
<b>Full Name</b>	Vivian Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Bk06 Dars Lane - Potential for a community / church building to be the new home for Northchurch Baptist Church.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS180
<b>Person ID</b>	1174360
<b>Full Name</b>	Bruce Morris
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Delivering Growth.</b> The draft Local Plan includes 2236 new dwellings in or around Berkhamsted. This a very significant increase to an already densely built up historic town. The plan acknowledges that a significant proportion (1870) will be brought forward as urban extensions. The plan sensibly acknowledges the impact of this on the Chilterns AONB and attempts to minimise the impact by focusing on the South and to the West. It says these will delivered as a planned new neighbourhood.

Given a requirement to build new dwellings the approach is logical. I would like to make my support of the **exclusion** of the Ivy House Lane proposal from the Local Plan clear. It indicates that significant issues with access and infrastructure matter and that the beauty of the valley is being maintained where possible. I would argue that this piece of land be added to the AONB.

My concerns however relate to whether the council are in the position to make such significant changes to the town as a whole and are as follows.

1) These large decisions appear to be being made in advance of the revised government guidance on housing numbers. Greenbelt may be needlessly allocated for development and never returned if not necessary. I believe that it would be better to wait for the real housing numbers and make the decisions once this is known.

2) A key issue with creating new neighbourhoods is having both a workable and funded infrastructure plan. I believe that this is still in draft form, much to the annoyance of many councillors I have watched debating the Local Plan. Allowing the development of so many houses before it is confirmed that the infrastructure is adequate is rash.

In conclusion it appears that in a rush to finalise a Local Plan, Dacorum Borough Council risk the destruction of valuable greenbelt land. This is unlikely to ever be returned and cannot be supported by me, hence my objection.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS188

**Person ID** 1257070

**Full Name** Peter Williamson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The strategy as a whole .

Berkhamsted market town built in a valley which historically makes enlarging a huge problem, already has very limited space available. Whether it is land to build on or infrastructure ie Doctors, Dentists, local Hospital and schools, services such as gas, water, electricity and sewerage.

To build above the valley of the town will cause many difficulties regarding traffic, parking and transport to and from the town centre especially where the only road is Shooters way from the bulk of the expansion indicated.

The site of Bankmill will also have to negotiate many problems including flooding, close proximity to the canal, river Bulbourne and the railway. The increase in traffic will see an obvious increase in pollution be it noise or particulates.

Your strategy states that growth will need to be carefully managed, no account of traffic increases transport improvements footfall in an already crowded town centre and pollution seem to be addressed only the outline to build more estates that have no infrastructure of their own only to increase pressure on existing facilities.

Gas, electric and water services are at a premium and the drainage system in situ is woefully lacking. For instance, if there is heavy rain the drains o/s the Esso garage on London Road often overflow, leaving waste on the verges. This an eyesore on entering Berkhamsted, that children have to walk through on their way to Swing Gate Lane Primary School.

The plan informs that there are few opportunities for new road capacity and then it is stated the edge of town locations need to ensure that these facilities are enhanced. All growth areas will provide on and off site measures to alleviate the problem. This being so do you expect residents to walk to and from town or will a bus service be provided ?

In the past new housing has resulted in more traffic using poor road connections to the town and increasing parking and congestion. This is the reality of over crowding a small market town to become a large congested town with little infrastructure and even less hospitality.

To build more on green belt and farm land will lead to an increase in pollution and more congestion also a reduction in produce from our already shrinking farm land.

The impact on drainage from these growth areas will be a huge problem as more land is built on, the run off areas will be lessened resulting in more water unable to drain naturally.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS245
<b>Person ID</b>	1258857
<b>Full Name</b>	James Robinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Delivering Growth</p> <p>This all seems like a massive increase to what is obviously an already highly populated historic town.</p> <p>One of the main reasons for choosing to live in Berkhamsted is it's unique mix of quiet countryside alongside the benefits of a historic market town. I am concerned this increased development will impact on the feel of Berkhamsted, especially with all the pressures on infrastructure already.</p> <p>I can appreciate that the plans appear to be focused to the South and West sides as this will have less impact on the Chilterns and it's AONB.</p> <p>I would like to add my support to the exclusion of the Ivy House Lane proposal as that would obviously have significant issues with infrastructure, I would like to see the natural beauty of the valley being maintained as much as possible. I, as others have noted, feel this should be included as an AONB.</p> <p>I sense that the plans for developments are being rushed through, possibly in a bid to finalise a local plan, before the decisions are taken higher up. This, in my opinion will ultimately lead to the destruction of valuable green belt land. As this is unlikely to ever be returned I cannot support these proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS293
<b>Person ID</b>	858896
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Wardle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

## Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment

I wish to object to the council's proposals for releasing and developing Green Belt land around Berkhamsted for significant housing development which would be detrimental to the character of Berkhamsted and the lives of those who already live in Berkhamsted. These proposals are no different to the consultation carried out in 2017 and therefore should not be adopted.

Specific areas of concern.

- 1 Berkhamsted is already overstretched for things such as access to doctor's / NHS dentists and availability of school places is limited, especially secondary school provision. This consultation does not take any of this into account in a proactive way and Berkhamsted would need significant pre-investment in infrastructure and facilities before any land should be considered for release for development. Infrastructure works should be carried out first and not be promised after the event. If it is promised as part of approvals it will probably not happen, due to things such as budget cuts.
- 2 The Dacroum area NHS facilities i.e. Hemel Hempstead Hospital continues to be run down at the same time the number of people living in the area is being increased. Issues around this need to be resolved before providing opportunities for increases in residents to ensure that there is an adequate service to support the increased community.
- 3 Traffic volumes within and around Berkhamsted will be significantly increased.
  - 1 Traffic through Berkhamsted has already risen to the levels similar to those before the A41 bypass was built.
  - 2 Whenever there is a road closure on the A41, all traffic comes through Berkhamsted which means it can take up to 2+ hours to get from one end of Berkhamsted to the other, since we only have a single main road.
  - 3 Just adding more traffic lights is not a solution and in most cases these make traffic congestion worse than before they were added.
  - 4 Will increase the levels of pollution.
  - 5 Suggesting that people will make more use of buses and cycling from the proposed sites is a pipe dream. With most of the proposed sites being on the edge of the Berkhamsted and up a hill people will use cars to travel into Berkhamsted.
  - 6 The idea of having cycle ways in Berkhamsted is not viable since the roads are not wide enough to support losing space to bicycle lanes.
  - 7 The majority of people of working age in Berkhamsted commute out of Berkhamsted to work. Berkhamsted cannot and will not support the work opportunities for all these new residents. Therefore, the proposed developments would significantly increase the number of journeys out of and into Berkhamsted both via car and train. With the trains on the West Coast mainline already full at peak times.
  - 8 The majority of properties in Berkhamsted own more than 1 vehicle so perking in residential areas without drives is already congested.
  - 9 Any traffic surveys should be based upon traffic volumes pre the COVID-19 pandemic. Any surveys undertaken during this period are flawed.
- 4 All brown field sites across the Borough should be considered and developed before any green belt land is released.
- 5 More properties should be allocated to Hemel Hempstead which will be more affordable.

- 1 With the high number of empty retail units in Hemel Hempstead, and the shift in retail to online, consideration should be given to reducing / compacting the size of the Hemel Hempstead shopping area and converting the space into accommodation.
- 6 Empty derelict / properties should be targeted.
- 7 Building on the green belt land close to the A41 will have significant disadvantages for any new residents from the point of view of air and noise pollution due to the close proximity to this major A road. It also results in the loss of habitat for animals.
- 8 One of the proposed areas can only be accessed by narrow single track country lanes.
- 9 Affordability:
  - 1 Most, if not all of the land parcels mentioned on the consultation are areas next to mainly detached houses. So, I would hope that any new developments should be building houses of a similar stature/style, in keeping with those around. In which case those houses will not be affordable.
    - 1 A quick search of Rightmove shows 2 bedroom properties in the region of £200K - £680K, 4-5 bedroom £500K to over £3+million.
    - 2 Even the current building work at Bearroc Park lists houses from £450K - £910K.
  - • • Average UK House prices according to ONS October 2020 was £256K. Berkhamsted average is almost 3 times this figure at £705K.
- 1 1 1 Developers will target Berkhamsted with a housing mix to maximise their profits, without any consideration for the area or local people.
- 1 Berkhamsted is one of the most expensive places outside of London to live. Additional housing will just attract people from London to move to the area, since they are the only ones that can afford it and therefore this will push house prices up. Not make them more affordable.
- 2 Even if developers promise to build “affordable” homes all that will happen once they have planning permission is that they will claim that the site is not economically viable to support the level of affordable homes promised and will look to change their commitments so that they can make more profit.
- 3 People buying the “affordable” homes will look to sell them as soon as they can, at market rates not at affordable rates.
- 1 Any development granted should ensure that all new properties are developed in a sustainable manner and support sustainable transport. I.e all properties to have electric charging points, solar power, rain water collection, ground heating.
- 2 Although not directly part of this consultation I would also like to add that I object to the Bulbourne Cross proposal. This proposal will:
  - 1 Remove a large area of Green Belt land.
  - 2 Join Berkhamsted to Bourne End.

- 3 Increase traffic since it is not in close proximity to either Hemel Hempstead or Berkhamsted railway station and shopping facilities and would result in a large increase in traffic journeys. So not a green solution as the developers claim.
- 4 Moving the sporting facilities away from the centre of Berkhamsted would also result in more traffic journeys, especially if this involved younger children who would have to be driven rather than walked to facilities.
- 5 They are proposing to build a school close to the A41 which would result in high pollution levels around the school.
- 6 The proposed access point to this development is the A41 service area junction at Bourne End. This is an extremely dangerous junction with very short slip roads and it is common for accidents to occur here.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS328

**Person ID** 1259852

**Full Name** Imogen Wagstaff

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Bk01 South of Berkhamsted - I am opposed to this proposal because it involved building on green belt land, will increase traffic on roads which do not have capacity for this. The location of the development will necessitate that most home owners will need to use a car to access supermarkets, etc in the centre of town. This is not compatible with sustainability targets.

Bk03 - Haslam Playing Fields - I am opposed to this proposal. This development will involve felling trees which will negatively impact on natural ecosystems and natural flood defences for the town. It will increase traffic significantly on Cross Oak road which is already unable to cope with current levels of traffic because parts of it are single track and large parts do not have pavement and yet it is a route which many secondary school pupils have to walk along to go to secondary school. The increased construction traffic and general car traffic once the houses are built will be a hazard for pedestrians and impact negatively on the environment.

Bk06 - East of Darrs Lane - I am firmly opposed to this development as it is on greenbelt land and will significantly increase traffic on roads which do not have capacity for it. The land should be kept as a wildlife area to support natural ecosystems and to help protect against the impact of climate change.

Bk07 - Lock field, Northchurch - I am firmly opposed to this. My understanding is that this area is currently used for local allotments and food growing which should be encouraged and expanded in the local plan, not reduced.

Bk08 0 Rossway Farm - I am opposed to this development, it will increase traffic on roads which do not have the capacity to support this and the proposal is for too many houses, the number of houses should be reduced significantly and more space devoted to rewilding, local food growing and sustainable community practices.

BK13 - Gossoms End/Billet Lane - I support dwellings on top of a food store, but instead of a commercial large food store (such as Lidl which is proposed) I would prefer the food store to support reducing food miles to the area and support local farmers... a covered market for local businesses to sell locally grown food and locally produced essentials would be more sustainable in the long term environmentally and would show greater vision and commitment to achieving Dacorum's stated goals of addressing the climate emergency.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS381

**Person ID** 1260058

**Full Name** Redbourn Parish Council

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1260042

**Agent Full Name** David Mitchell

**Agent Organisation** Redbourn Parish Council

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS413



<b>Person ID</b>	405224
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jennifer R Honour
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are told that we need 2,230 more houses in Bekhamsted to be built by 2038. My point is that this averages at 123 houses per year. Surely Bearroc Park is enough of our quota for a few years.</p> <p>The local infrastructure is totally insufficient to support any more large GROWTH development. The water supply, sewage facilities, local roads, schools and virtually non-existent local hospital provision such as A+E and maternity services are either severely strained or not viable.</p> <p>We saw on the television news how Watford Hospital was completely overwhelmed by Covid 19, and was sending its seriously ill patients to Nottingham and other towns. This is UNACCEPTABLE.</p> <p>Our three beautiful Hertfordshire county towns have sacrificed TOO MUCH.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS415
<b>Person ID</b>	1260359
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Tim & Gemma Traylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I'm writing in strong objection to the plans to materially expand berkhamsted through the building of hundreds of new homes to the south and east of the town. I have attempted to submit comments via your portal but can't seem to find a way to submit them (see attached screen recording of my attempts). If there is something I'm doing wrong and I need to submit my views differently then pls advise.

The South-East is already extremely built up. The area is heavily populated and facilities are struggling. There is a lack of NHS dental and GP services and the nearest hospitals are in Watford, Luton and Stoke Mandeville - all of which are some distance away, and very much struggling with capacity. Travel links, particularly into London are at bursting - often (pre-covid) it was impossible to get a seat on peak time trains and the revised timetable introduced last year was a disaster causing frequent delays, so sever that London Northwestern agreed to freeze some ticket prices this year. When facilities and commuting capacity is already this stretched it is lunacy to attempt to cram in hundreds, let along thousands, of additional homes. Furthermore recent developments - such as the one at Bearroc Park were grotesquely over-dense - to the extend that roads were so narrow they had to be made one-way, and parking on the side of the road is totally impossible without needing to park on the curb - resulting in a very over-built and stressful environment. The planned development density I suspect is materially higher than that of the existing Hall Park estate and approving any plan, let along such a dense plan, is wholly inappropriate.

At present the planned building site is beautiful fields with lovely walks which deliver material health benefits to the local community. My family and I frequently walk around the footpaths and through the wooded area to the south of Berkhamsted between the Hall Park estate and the A41 and really value the green space available there.

I cannot understand why such a major plan would even be countenanced on such a beautiful green-filled site in such an already overbuilt area with such stressed services. I struggle to see how any public servant acting in the best interests of their constituents would ever support such a plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS416

**Person ID** 1260361

**Full Name** Ms Anne Khazam

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am a visitor to Berkhamsted, though I also hope to live there one day with my partner who is already a long time resident. I wish to record my response to the Dacorum local plan.

I am writing because I am rather concerned to hear about the plan to build 800 dwellings between Upper Hall Park and the A41.

I have often walked in that area, and I think it will be a great shame to build on what is green belt land, and on a green space which is clearly valuable for the current residents. I also wonder if Berkhamsted will have the infrastructure to cope with so many new residents? I wonder how this will affect traffic in the area and also the train service.

If you do need new homes though it seems to me that it is worth re-assessing the situation once we are passed the effects of the coronavirus. There may be quite a bit of office space in the town centre that could be converted into flats, rather than building in the countryside.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS471

**Person ID** 1258240

**Full Name** Adele Giles

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The whole amounts to over-development. At this rate there will be a linear conurbation from the M25 along the length of the A41 to Tring. The proposals seem to take advantage of this largely wealthy commuter town to the benefit the property development companies rather than the needs of the community.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS516

**Person ID** 1260803

**Full Name** Rollo Prendergast

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The lack of a holistic approach to the opportunities Berkhamsted offers, which encompasses environmental and recreational needs, is coupled with unrealistic assumptions of affordability and transport solutions. There is also a need to assess housing needs post-Brexit, falling national birth rate and the likelihood of viral pandemics becoming the norm.  Please see overall commentary attached: Local Plan Response Submission
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Local Plan Response Submission.docx</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS561
<b>Person ID</b>	1260936
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Hadden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	By its historic nature, having been built in part before the invention of the motor car and in other parts before widespread ownership of cars, Berkhamsted town centre's roads are already massively overloaded before the proposed addition of thousands of new residents and their vehicles. The densely built-up nature of the town and its narrow streets also makes road-widening close to impossible.  Regarding the proposed infrastructure improvements (new schools and health & medical facilities for example), the current facilities are not adequate for the current population so large parts of the infrastructure improvements would need to be operational before any significant change in the population.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS611
<b>Person ID</b>	1261122
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS638
<b>Person ID</b>	1261183
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Fairfull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and

adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.

My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.

The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.

Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity? You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan. It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.

Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.

These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.

In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through

such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS695

**Person ID** 1256588

**Full Name** Wendy Silcock

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The predicted number of houses and school places required flies in the face of current and predicted population figures. Dacorum needs to demonstrate that there is an actual demand for new housing and schools on the scale used in the draft plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS720

**Person ID** 1261251

**Full Name** Lesley Ashden

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see previous comments
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS850
<b>Person ID</b>	334408
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Charles Toner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>ROADS / TRAFFIC</b></p> <p>The town has been enlarged steadily over the 4 decades that we have lived here. Then, there was a problem with long queues of through traffic along the High Street. The opening of the A41 by-pass almost 30 years ago substantially relieved this problem. Since then the population has grown steadily to over 21,000, and traffic congestion is again a major problem in the town itself and through traffic has grown again too. There has been no improvement in many aspects of the infrastructure of the town , in particular in the roads connecting the heart of the town. Shootersway/Kingshill Way is a semi rural , narrow road which runs parallel to the High Street on the south side of the town . These two roads, High St and Shootersway, are also used as through roads. There are four roads which connect them. All are steep, two very narrow, and with parking allowed in many parts, because of old terraced houses without drives. All of these roads are inadequate for today's town traffic volumes. In addition they have to carry large heavy goods vehicles some of which serve the town , and some of which are through vehicles. Traffic congestion and hold ups in the town centre are normal . The lack of proper road maintenance (and this is not temporary) has made a bad situation worse. Traffic is constantly avoiding potholes or being held up by temporary traffic lights while short term road patching is carried out. Footpaths for some of these roads , particularly Shootersway, are narrow, inadequate and unsafe for children walking to school. I have highlighted these problems of the roads because they are the most obvious of several inadequate aspects of the town's infrastructure which are obstacles to some of the proposed developments . I could go into similar detail about the unacceptable standard of others : schools, drainage, domestic water supply and water pressures - and more, but the main problem is that the roads are inadequate NOW for the levels of present usage.</p>



A holistic infrastructure plan is needed, coordinated with the County, in the way that you have been encouraged to do, rather than obtained piecemeal by contributions from individual developments. No such infrastructure plans have been put forward in this consultation.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS864
<b>Person ID</b>	211406
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jennifer Habib
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chiltern Society Planning Field Officer for Dacorum Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There are approximately 5,000 new houses proposed, just for Tring and Berkhamsted, which would increase their joint population by half as much again. Every house will hold at least four people and two cars, some houses many more, roughly 20,000 people and 10,000 cars to be expected over time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 No allowance has been made for extra Doctors, more School places at each level including the sixth form college, nor <u>transport services</u> [new bus routes, existing road widening, <u>new roads</u>, new larger car parking areas for the shops] in the plan, but these will undoubtedly be needed and there is no budget for them. The cost of these will be many millions and there is no way they can be paid for by house building contractors.</li> <li>2 There is already a shortage of public open space within the towns especially Berkhamsted so any new building should incorporate far more than is shown. This will put too much pressure on the Ashridge National Trust area and the surrounding Countryside. Due to Brexit our farmers will be able to farm all their land, as the EU quota system no longer applies, so we need the farms to grow our meat and vegetables and should not build on them.</li> <li>3 The plans seriously impinge on the existing and supposedly protected Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is actually proposing to build over an existing Cricket and Football pitch, despite the fact that Berkhamsted is officially lacking in public open space. The Government is putting more stress on protecting green spaces as well as the Green Belt.</li> </ol>

- 4 The Government is also stressing the need to protect wild life and the natural environment, but these plans eliminate the wild life corridors and areas of special interest at present protected, will the destroy huge areas of habitat, create light pollution from all the new street lamps, plus human disturbance which will destroy wild life.
- 5 If these proposals go ahead the entire character of both areas will change beyond repair. The planned housing touches the borders of the AONB and has completely removed the protective areas of Green Belt around them and also the Green Belt separating the towns. [which is the main reason for the Green belt] The Government has recently stated that Housing is not a reason for losing Green Belt areas and also that AONB areas are precious, their character is irreplaceable and must be retained together with the valuable wild life spaces and travel corridors previously planned.. The Government also said that the first principle of new housing is that it should be built on brown field sites, also that affordable housing is a local priority, there is no mention of brown Field site use.
- 6 If these plans are built there will be a great need for new sources to be found for the water supply. The Chalk Streams of the Chilterns are a National Treasure. The water companies already take more water than is advisable from them , yet still we have water shortages every hot summer and calls for hose bans. A new reservoir for the area, capable of supplying the extra 60,000 gallons per day which will be needed, together with a new water treatment plant and water collection from the street drainage will be needed, but there is no budget or suggested plans for this.
- 7 Similarly the current sewage disposal system for the two towns is already overloaded because of the volume of new housing already built in the last 5 years. For this level of new housing a new sewage treatment plant and new main sewers will be needed, also not shown.
- 8 To keep up with the need for much more electric power to be made available to support electric cars and support our government's plans for climate change, [the reduction of gas use for heating and cooking] other ways must be used.
- 9 Every new building should be heated by heat exchangers underground and roofed with photovoltaic cells, which are available in roof tiles rather than in ugly black panels.. This has been done with great success by several leading architects and should now be made compulsory for all new housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS893

**Person ID** 1261484

**Full Name** Simon Wraight

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>"23.117 The retail foodstore allocation at Gossoms End"</p> <p>This has been vacant since 2016, how can we rely on the development of a shop when the only thing built on the vacant land in over 5 years is a fence?</p> <p>"23.123 Network Rail has highlighted that growth in the town will require improvements to the station capacity, including, for example, new cycle parking and the upgrading of buildings."</p> <p>The station already has enough capacity to overwhelm the train capacities. Expanding a station does not deal with over crowded trains. How will the extra passenger numbers be addressed by the train companies themselves? Can extra train capacity be guaranteed?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS926
<b>Person ID</b>	1264329
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIC MILLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There are approximately 5,000 new houses proposed, just for Tring and Berkhamsted, which would increase their joint population by half as much again. Every house will hold at least four people and two cars, some houses many more, roughly 20,000 people and 10,000 cars to be expected over time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 No allowance has been made for extra Doctors, more School places at each level including the sixth form college, nor <u>transport services</u> [new bus routes, existing road widening, <u>new roads</u>, new larger car parking areas for the shops] in the plan, but these will undoubtedly be needed and there is no budget for them. The cost of these will be many millions and there is no way they can be paid for by house building contractors.</li> <li>2 There is already a shortage of public open space within the towns especially Berkhamsted so any new building should incorporate far more than is shown. This will put too much pressure on the Ashridge National Trust area</li> </ol>

- and the surrounding Countryside. Due to Brexit our farmers will be able to farm all their land, as the EU quota system no longer applies, so we need the farms to grow our meat and vegetables and should not build on them.
- 3 The plans seriously impinge on the existing and supposedly protected Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is actually proposing to build over an existing Cricket and Football pitch, despite the fact that Berkhamsted is officially lacking in public open space. The Government is putting more stress on protecting green spaces as well as the Green Belt.
  - 4 The Government is also stressing the need to protect wild life and the natural environment, but these plans eliminate the wild life corridors and areas of special interest at present protected, will the destroy huge areas of habitat, create light pollution from all the new street lamps, plus human disturbance which will destroy wild life.
  - 5 If these proposals go ahead the entire character of both areas will change beyond repair. The planned housing touches the borders of the AONB and has completely removed the protective areas of Green Belt around them and also the Green Belt separating the towns. [which is the main reason for the Green belt] The Government has recently stated that Housing is not a reason for losing Green Belt areas and also that AONB areas are precious, their character is irreplaceable and must be retained together with the valuable wild life spaces and travel corridors previously planned.. The Government also said that the first principle of new housing is that it should be built on brown field sites, also that affordable housing is a local priority, there is no mention of brown Field site use.
  - 6 If these plans are built there will be a great need for new sources to be found for the water supply. The Chalk Streams of the Chilterns are a National Treasure. The water companies already take more water than is advisable from them , yet still we have water shortages every hot summer and calls for hose bans. A new reservoir for the area, capable of supplying the extra 60,000 gallons per day which will be needed, together with a new water treatment plant and water collection from the street drainage will be needed, but there is no budget or suggested plans for this.
  - 7 Similarly the current sewage disposal system for the two towns is already overloaded because of the volume of new housing already built in the last 5 years. For this level of new housing a new sewage treatment plant and new main sewers will be needed, also not shown.
  - 8 To keep up with the need for much more electric power to be made available to support electric cars and support our government's plans for climate change, [the reduction of gas use for heating and cooking] other ways must be used.
  - 9 Every new building should be heated by heat exchangers underground and roofed with photovoltaic cells, which are available in roof tiles rather than in ugly black panels.. This has been done with great success by several leading architects and should now be made compulsory for all new housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS957

**Person ID** 1266581

**Full Name** HELEN YOUNG

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I live at (address removed) and I write to put forward my objections to the proposed developments set out in the local plan, particularly in relation to those that will affect Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Firstly, the size and sheer scale of proposed development in Berkhamsted is entirely disproportionate to its existing (and desirable) size. The already congested main route through the valley floor will not be able to cope with the influx of extra traffic, nor will its amenities.</p> <p>The erosion and development of green belt land is utterly wrong, and cannot be reversed once done. It will entirely change the landscape of Berkhamsted.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS964
<b>Person ID</b>	1261560
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Gray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The scale of proposed development in Dacorum and in particular Berkhamsted/Northchurch is quite preposterous. No doubt the fault of the Government!</p> <p>However the plans were developed before the pandemic.</p>

Over one percent of the uk population have died and we have not yet reached the top of the spiral of infection. Planning must recognise short as well as long term expectations and population growth over the next decades is likely to grow much more slowly than was assumed up to the end of 2019.

Whatever the figures, insufficient thought seems to have been given to the facilities of education, traffic or doctor's services.

Education. Darrs Lane is as it says, a lane with single lane traffic almost throughout its length. Walking on it is well neigh impossible.

Traffic. The plan recognises that there is no way to increase road access on the south side of town. Parking in the town is likely to become quite impossible if the plans are accepted.

Medical and doctor services are at capacity. No plans to extend appear in report?

Please place on record my objection to the entire proposal.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1007

**Person ID** 1261651

**Full Name** Linda Hussey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Northchurch  
I object to removing land from Green Belt.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1032

**Person ID** 399849

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Beryl Edwards
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Land designated GREEN BELT is sacrosanct to me. It is needed to prevent dwellings covering the countryside willy-nilly and, maybe, eventually joining outlying villages with the nearest town.</p> <p>All the areas you have detailed are designated Green Belt, except for Berkhamsted Civic Centre and the Lidl/Jewson site.</p> <p>Except for the two on the A4251 all the areas are at the top of the hills making access difficult: too steep to walk or to cycle.</p> <p>The UTILITY SERVICES are not up to standard to provide for new houses. Sewers are mainly Victorian, and the water supply is already under threat.</p> <p>The average HOUSE PRICES in Berkhamsted and Northchurch are higher than average. This precludes essential professionals like doctors and teachers from buying and, in this way, providing a service to the town. We are extremely short of doctors, making getting doctors appointments very difficult even before the current situation.</p> <p>FINALLY, Berkhamsted and Northchurch have had considerable numbers of houses built in the last few years: notably Royal Keys at Hall Park, the Wellcome site, Castle Village, the Police Station site, the corner of Swing Gate Lane, Bearroc 1 and Bearroc 2. No extra infrastructure has been created to provide for these new residents. I consider we have done our share of providing new dwellings in the Dacorum area.</p> <p>I hope you will understand my predicament and accept my comments, as I cannot be the only local resident who has difficulty and, presumably, it is our comments you want.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1258
<b>Person ID</b>	1253932
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Scrivens
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	BK01 + Berkhamsted Retail and Education. Beyond my concerns about the loss of GreenBelt land that will happen if these proposals go forward in current form, the Delivery Strategy for Retail does not outline anything new in addition to plans already in place; there's no plan for new infrastructure or shops to support the growth. The new carpark already exists, the site for a new supermarket already exists. Nothing new is planned in this Strategy to support 2000+ homes and inhabitants.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1287
<b>Person ID</b>	1259116
<b>Full Name</b>	Tring in Transition (TinT)
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1313
<b>Person ID</b>	1261996
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Howe



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkhamsted Civic Centre and land to the rear of High Street</li> <li>• Clarence Road road has 19 dwellings and is a cul-de-sac</li> <li>• Has anyone (from the council/developer) stopped to monitor the traffic including council vehicles, police cars, couriers, dental patients, commuters plus residents who use this road; it is two-way but there is no room for two vehicles to pass each other at the same time</li> <li>• With 16 more dwellings how is this going to work satisfactorily?</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1341
<b>Person ID</b>	1145350
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Edward Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Increasing towns bpopulation by 20% is not accpetable.</p> <p>There is one high street, which already has issues with traffic. Parking at the station is inadequate, so that means the surrounding areas will have cars thrown all over the place.</p> <p>Unacceptable</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1348
<b>Person ID</b>	1261962
<b>Full Name</b>	Claire Crouchley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed number of new homes in Berkhamsted is not supported by the more recent ONS figures. Although there is a clear need for substantial amounts of additional housing, the justification for such a large amount of development on existing Green Belt land is simply not there.</p> <p>23.99 and 23.112 The valley nature of Berkhamsted is recognised by the document but insufficient account is taken of what this actually means in terms of the limited options for improving roads and other transport links and of the inevitable loss of the current openness and views that would result from developing the valley sides.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1351
<b>Person ID</b>	772477
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr. Roy Warren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Manager Sport England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Paragraph 23.111 – Haslam Fields</p> <p>Support is offered for the requirement for the playing pitches associated with the Haslam Fields Growth Area to be replaced at Berkhamsted School’s Haresfoot campus and for the proposal to make a linked allocation for the replacement sports facilities. This approach helps provide certainty that the replacement facilities are deliverable in practice, and therefore the development allocation on existing playing fields can be justified and meet Government policy on the loss of playing fields.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1368
<b>Person ID</b>	398857
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Tinworth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I disagree strongly with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed. I consider the plans to be excessive in extent and would change the character of the area completely. I can see no justification for this degree of housing expansion in Berkhamsted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1371
<b>Person ID</b>	221909
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Stephen Doughty

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the development proposals for Berkhamsted as outlined in the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) and also to the unsolicited Thakeham proposal for Bulbourne Cross.</p> <p>The algorithm on which the consultation is based has been withdrawn by the Government. The algorithm which has replaced it uses out of date data. To continue until a new algorithm is established is a waste of public money. The reason for insisting on continuing to develop a plan based on unsound assumptions demands an answer as quite candidly it falls below the expected governance standard and is open to challenge on that alone, especially given the potential legal cost exposure. What is the reason please?</p> <p>Government policy is now to rebalance the economy of the UK to support the development of the Midlands and North where brownfield sites exist and thereby take the pressure off greenfield sites in London and the South East. Releasing greenbelt land in London and the South East undermines this so-called 'Northern Powerhouse' policy.</p> <p>Greenfield sites need to be retained for agriculture in a Brexit and climate change environment where the UK needs to be more self-sufficient than previously. Reliance on imported foods is becoming increasingly unwise in view of the need to reduce carbon emissions from transport sources and the need to guarantee food security in an increasingly unstable world political environment.</p> <p>Water supplies in the aquifer in the south of England are unable to meet current demand, increasing the possibility of water shortages. This is particularly acute in the chalk areas of the Chilterns.</p> <p>The location of Berkhamsted within a narrow valley makes access difficult, especially in view of the existing housing stock on through roads near the centre of town which has limited off street parking provision. The steepness and narrowness of many of these residential roads, often with alternating directional traffic flow, makes cycling and walking relatively unattractive leading to high levels of car use within the town. Residents of new housing developments on the edge of town are even more likely to use a car to reach the centre of town due to the distance. There is no evidence that existing public transport services have been able to provide a realistic alternative to use of the car, so it is unrealistic to believe that new services linked to new developments will be sustainable. In view of the developed nature of the town centre, there is no ability to improve traffic capacity or flow, let alone provide cycle lanes or off-street parking for residents. Increasing the size of the town is therefore fundamentally unsustainable and fails to meet plan objectives, despite evident window-dressing.</p> <p>The evidence of recent developments such as Bearoc Park in Berkhamsted is that the new housing provision has largely been of the style and price that is most profitable to developers. Minimal social housing obligations mean that these developments have had little impact on meeting the housing needs of existing local residents and has only served to</p>

attract new people from outside the area. While that may help local maximise authority income, it fails to meet local needs and pays lip-service to sustainability goals.

In summary, the Local Plan proposals are fundamentally unsound being based on discredited algorithms and out-of-date data and do not address the underlying inconsistency with central government development strategies. These issues must be addressed and resolved with Central Government prior to any further consideration of the Local Plan proposals or there can be no confidence in the objectivity of the process or in those responsible for delivering it. Until that is done, there is no point in providing detailed comment on specific aspects of the draft Local Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1385

**Person ID** 1262052

**Full Name** Ms Severine Robitaille

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

My objections are on several grounds:

- Neither Berkhamsted nor Tring could cope with such a large increase in population. In the case of Tring doubling the size seems a ludicrous idea
- The loss of character of both towns; people live here for its countryside green appeal, which would be highly impacted. This will decrease value of these towns significantly
- There would be a strong ecological impact with water not draining properly through existing fields and creating flooding
- The infrastructure of the towns could not accommodate it: the roads are already congested with high pollution levels
- There is no talk of increase of public transport and cycle ways
- What would be put in place to replace the loss of green land?
- It currently takes 2 weeks to get a gp appointment, we would need to employ new doctors; there is no serious proposal for this

- It is going against government policy and building on Greenbelt; as you are required too, you should look at brownfield sites first
- The level of new cars would bring a rise in pollution levels and the destruction of the green barrier between A41 and Berkhamsted town would have a high impact on Air Quality. It would also be quite unpleasant to live there

In short I object on ecological grounds as destruction of natural habitat, large increase in pollution levels, destruction of town character. I believe that option of brownfield sites should be looked at primarily and a smaller scale plan considered.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1386

**Person ID** 215946

**Full Name** Mr Iain Manson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a +30-year resident of Berkhamsted, I have taken great interest in the development of the town and particularly how it has grown to meet the housing needs within the borough. Therefore, I would like to record my views regarding the proposals contained within the "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)" which I understand is designed to set out DBC's approach to accommodating further growth across the borough, outlining which sites are proposed for development and the policies that will cover the delivery of these developments and other developments within Dacorum.

**I would like to register a very strong objection to the choice of several of the development sites that are contained within the Plan. Given that I live in Berkhamsted, the prime objection is to the proposed developments within the Berkhamsted area.** My objection is made upon three fundamental strategic grounds that I have set out below:

- 1 **Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision.** Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, I have serious concerns regarding the sheer scale of proposed development in Dacorum. The Council appears to have failed to take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development

due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB. Indeed, recent Government guidance on calculating housing need has been, at best, confusing. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is **not** the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. **The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them.** I would remind the Council that on Wednesday 16 December the government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government also said:

- ***"More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places."*** and they went on to say ***"Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."***

1 **Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land.** The Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". However, it is evident that in meeting the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the "over-inflated" housing need, the Council proposes that, as a necessity, development must, therefore, take place on Green Belt land or land that is specially designated for other purposes. 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; these are for many people the prime reasons that they have chosen to live in this area. I remind the Council of the stance of our local Member of Parliament, Gagan Mohindra, on Green Belt land, which was included in an email response to me dated 17 November 2020. This appears to set out the Council's duty to plan for housing provision and protect our Green Belt and specially designated land:

- **"I stood on a platform of protecting the Green Belt and will continue to fight that battle on a national level. I have previously written to Minister Rt Hon Chris Pincher at MHCLG about my concerns. At a local level, we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents. The only way to do this is through Dacorum Borough Council finalising its Local Plan as soon as possible".**

1 **Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure.** Specifically, I look at the proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted and state categorically that there is insufficient consideration in the Plan for

the provision of new or of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments. Berkhamsted is already a Town which is at capacity in terms of schooling, road services, water supply and wastewater disposal.

I trust that my objection can be taken fully into account and I am sure that you will see many more similar objections from other residents of Berkhamsted that the proposed developments within the town are wrongly premised, should not take place on Green Belt land and do not make proper provision for improved infrastructure for the town to accommodate such large developments.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1389

**Person ID** 1262053

**Full Name** Ms Sandra Lawman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I object to the scale of the proposed development and particularly the impact on all types of infrastructure, not least railway provision.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1395

**Person ID** 1262056

**Full Name** Sue & Graham Holland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to put forward my strong objections to the proposed Local Plan for Berkhamsted with the construction of 2236 houses in the coming future, particularly those developments planned for Shootersway and Kingshill Way.</p> <p>My reasons are listed below:-</p> <p>1. Traffic The traffic levels along Shootersway and down our road (Cross Oak) are off the scale now. With school run vehicles and delivery vehicles, people going to work etc, the traffic is nose-to-tail morning and late afternoon. There is only one speed restriction which has little effect, and in our opinion Cross Oak Road should be a limited access road because of its use as a cut through /alternative to Kings Road. With the obvious proximity of Bearroc Park, which is increasing in capacity, traffic will be at maximum levels by the end of the year anyway. The local roads are not designed for high levels of traffic, tarmac regularly breaks down, and the narrowing with no pavements puts pedestrians at risk.</p> <p>2. Infrastructure Berkhamsted's facilities are bursting at the seams NOW. Doctors surgeries are over-subscribed and not able to take more patients, schools are full. With the added injection of 2236 new households (potentially 6,500 + people) I fear the town will implode on itself.</p> <p>3. Preservation of Berkhamsted as an historical town. Berkhamsted is a market town with a lot of history. It needs to remain and retain its identity in the future.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1401
<b>Person ID</b>	1262061
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Pamela Clegg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted local plan to build 2236 houses</p> <p>I am writing to lodge my disagreement to the proposed plan to build this number of house in Berkhamsted. The number is excessive and well above the forecast for the borough calculated by the ONS.</p> <p>The impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate. There has been a recent, major development 'Bearroc' which already impacts the infrastructure I strongly disagree with the local plan to build this number of dwellings.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1403
<b>Person ID</b>	222926
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr. Keith Skinner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to state my very strong disagreement to your local plans for the Berkhamsted area.</p> <p>The housing numbers are excessive, not only because they are based on incorrect statistical assumptions, but also because Berkhamsted has no capacity to absorb the housing numbers proposed. There is already a lack of support infrastructure, in terms of schools, medical facilities, road/traffic capacity, etc. etc., but also your plans will lead to yet more pressure on local amenities, thus making the quality of life in Berkhamsted poorer.</p> <p>This COVID pandemic has shown us all how important space is, and yet your proposals will reduce that. Overcrowded areas are not healthy, so your plans will also have a detrimental knock-on effect on the wider Dacorum area.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Berkhamsted since 1985 and I have personally seen the negative impact on the towns's infrastructure, environment, and the well-being of its residents, resultant from all the developments that have taken place in the last years. So your new plan will only make the situation worse. Please do not go ahead with it.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1405

<b>Person ID</b>	1262063
<b>Full Name</b>	TIMOTHY BAILEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a resident (address removed), and having to cope with ridiculous traffic already (often unable to even get out of the drive) I strongly <u>oppose</u> the proposed housing plan for Berkhamsted especially around Kingshill Way, Shooters Way and Chesham Road. The numbers are ridiculous and can only make congestion and quality of life worse for local residents and significantly devalue our properties. With the new housing development in Bearroc Park in Shooters way we have already seen an increase in traffic. The numbers of houses proposed also are significantly above those required by ONS.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1411
<b>Person ID</b>	1151668
<b>Full Name</b>	MR PETER CRACKNELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I write in my position as a long-time homeowner in Berkhamsted. My family has lived in three different houses in the town over a period of 40 years, and in that time we have seen substantial changes to Berkhamsted, measured in population, house numbers and area.

The 2013 'Core Strategy' plans have been especially significant to us, as we have noticed the town centre struggling to cope with the constant increase in traffic, making shopping in the town these days a less than relaxing pastime. We did, however, realise that there is a need for sensible increases to the size of Berkhamsted in order to satisfy that housing demand.

The latest proposals are so far outside those of the Core Strategy that it's hard to realise we are still talking about the same town - Berkhamsted. At this point I'd like to persuade you to come to Berkhamsted on a weekday morning to experience the overcrowded nature of the town. But of course for the time being Covid would make that a less than accurate impression. What we can do, as indeed can you or any residents of Berkhamsted, is walk out of the town onto one of the many stretches of Green Belt, and this we do constantly, not just to fight the possible effects of the pandemic.

The proposed planning ideas put forward by the Council would delete most of those opportunities for most of the residents. Green Belt was designed to be a benefit to residents who could walk a short distance and wind down, without having to get in the car or bus to reach the start of the process.

The Core Strategy represented a large increase in the population of the town, but the new proposals go so far beyond this that Berkhamsted would not be what it currently still is - a medium sized town that can grow at a reasonable rate without losing all the benefits that attracted families in the first place.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1413

**Person ID** 1262068

**Full Name** Ms Emma Starnowska-Reed

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am aware of the up and coming ideas around the increased housing in our local areas and although I agree that additional housing would be required the proposals are not well considered and go far beyond the current & future demand.

I have found information on the subject that concerns me which are as follows:

Greenbelt

- Nearly all development proposed will be on Greenbelt. – this is against Government policy.
- The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. A green buffer is needed.
- They should look at further Brownfield sites – as they are required to do and consider these areas as a priority, rather than looking to Greenbelt land at the first instance.
- I live by another area of Greenbelt also being threatened by the move of the Egerton Rothersay school, the DBC seem intent of leaving us with no Greenbelt land, which makes our area so special. If I wanted to live in a concrete town, I’d already be living in one

#### Sustainability

- This is nonsense. Berkhamsted is seen as ‘sustainable’ because it has (some) good facilities, despite the many constraints (hilly, congested main route through valley floor.) Most of the proposed building is at the top of the hill, where most people will rely on their cars for travel in and out of town. There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted’s traffic situation.

#### Pollution

- Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Our town lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area.
- I would strongly argue that the proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.
- DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.

#### Housing numbers

- 24% increase in housing proposed in Berkhamsted (more than 900 houses) 50% increase proposed in Tring
- Council using outdated (2014) housing projections. Half of this number needed in reality (using more recent ONS data from 2018).
- DBC *should* challenge the proposed housing numbers – which are dictated by central Government, rather than just accept them.

#### Housing distribution

- Hemel, Berkhamsted and Tring are all expected to take their ‘fair share’ of housing proposed. Each of these settlements have their own issues and constraints (topography-how hilly it is/valley, congestions, lack of public transport, lack of safe cycle ways, etc.) However, DBC seems to just be looking at the numbers – and not taking these vital issues into account.

#### Infrastructure

- The transport study takes *no* account of Berkhamsted's geography and valley setting. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.
- No significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.
- No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes.
- No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)
- The 'wildlife corridors' are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don't connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.

#### Water

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It's not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested.

Please take these points into serious consideration and look at using more current data than relying on the old. What is being proposed is damaging to these local communities & once in place is not reversible.

#### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1414
<b>Person ID</b>	1262067
<b>Full Name</b>	MOYA WILLIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a homeowner I am very concerned about the effects of heavy rain running down from Shooterway area as we already have deep puddles in the road after rain. Also the extra sewage could well be a problem.  I would like assurances than I can sue the council if the road is flooded as a result of the extra load on the system.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1417
<b>Person ID</b>	399244
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Teresa Langridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to say that I don't agree with the Local Plan to build houses in Berkhamsted. The numbers are excessive and in the area West Berkhamsted seem disproportionate, especially given the number of developments being build at Bearroc Park.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1420
<b>Person ID</b>	1149455
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter and Hilary Mills
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a long time resident of Berkhamsted I am emailing you to object most strongly to the proposed development of our green belt and therefore destruction of our beautiful town with its green surrounds. We will no longer be an area of outstanding natural beauty.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1422
<b>Person ID</b>	1149455
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter and Hilary Mills
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The town is already groaning under the stress of too many people and too many cars. This is a small town, it does not have the infrastructure to accommodate more families.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1423
<b>Person ID</b>	1149455
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter and Hilary Mills
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We do not have enough doctors, dentists or schools as it is. I implore you to rethink this disastrous plan!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1427
<b>Person ID</b>	398881
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Bird
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	To the planning consultation committee I am writing to say that I disagree with the local plan under consultation, in particular I disagree with the number of new houses planned for Berkhamsted, which is already struggling with the existing infrastructure, doctors, congestion, parking etc. and it would also affect the green belt, pollution and more.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1459
<b>Person ID</b>	1163187
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Sparks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have read the above draft plan, and would comment below regarding Berkhamsted and your change of policy regarding Green Belt land.

What happened to the 2013 Core Strategy Vision for Berkhamsted of “maintaining the strong valley and linear character of the settlement” – now dumped because of the proposed expansion which is clearly developer led and for commercial concerns?

DBC have been spectacularly unsuccessful in their intention to offer affordable homes in developments in Berkhamsted and their intention now must be questionable. They accept developer’s monies to fund their other projects and, due to the massive shortfall in their income due to the pandemic, this will only continue.

The site of the proposed development is well away from existing services and facilities in Berkhamsted. I live at the top of one of the valley sides in Berkhamsted, and it is impossible to shop and carry that shopping home without using a car. Yet, you intend to site your developments at this distance and gradient, which will only encourage more cars in a town already saturated with traffic. Berkhamsted does not have the capability to increase its road infrastructure and your plans will, therefore, be extremely damaging to the health of the town’s residents.

During the Covid pandemic I have used the Green Belt countryside around me (at the top of the valley) for exercise in an effort to keep fit, as have very many cyclists, joggers and other walkers. This countryside will all disappear if your draft plan is ever realised, and I will then have to resort to a car journey to find green space to walk. Your draft plan is actively encouraging residents to use their cars.

If your draft plan is ever implemented where is everyone going to work who lives in this proposed housing in Berkhamsted? You have not included proposals to increase employment opportunities in Berkhamsted, so presumably these new residents will be travelling outside the town to work. Neither the train or the bus will be a viable transport option due to the siting of the developments on steep valley sides and at the top of the valley, so there will be more cars on the road.

Sewage and wastewater treatment is at capacity in Berkhamsted. If anybody from DBC ever took the time to investigate the problems which already exist here because of inadequate sewage infrastructure, your draft plan would not glibly state that the Utility Company and the developer will deliver on this - without providing any evidence.

I believe that Berkhamsted has reached its limits in housing development. These draft plans indicate an increase of almost 25% in dwellings and, as stated, are being unduly influenced by developers' profitable interests to build in the town. DBC has conceded that Berkhamsted already suffers from congestion and poor air quality, yet your draft plans can only compound these problems. These plans do nothing for the town's inhabitants.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1479

**Person ID** 1262139

**Full Name** Michael Hancock

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Just to repeat my previous concern that Berkhamsted town centre will become gridlocked with the growth in housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1522

**Person ID** 1261876

**Full Name** Richard Sidwell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to state that I disagree with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>Berkhamsted has seen a significant amount of new builds in recent years. Continued development will put undue strain on its infrastructure. The town already suffers from high levels of traffic and historic parking problems (which will not be alleviated by the new multi-story car park).</p> <p>Green belt areas were created for a purpose – they were not for housing development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1581
<b>Person ID</b>	1262286
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Steven Lucker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Berkhamsted in Dacorum and I am writing to register my concerns about your development plans for the area titled: Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038.</p> <p>We should not stand in the way of progress, but within reason.</p> <p>Your plans appear overly aggressive and will undoubtedly have a hugely negative environmental impact which does not seem in line with the way the world is changing in light of a climate emergency. This is a real worry for people everywhere. This level of new housing proposed will also place huge pressure on the already creaking local infrastructure.</p> <p>Just to plant a load of new housing on otherwise green plots also seems to ignore the changing world with retail sites, office blocks etc. coming available post pandemic.</p>

The pollution this will bring alone will drive many people away and take away what was the original appeal of the town. We moved our family out of London to Berkhamsted so our kids would breathe better air, suffer less noise pollution and have more space to move.

New affordable housing is one thing. This does not feel like that.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1588

**Person ID** 1261220

**Full Name** Kam Gossal

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Having read the local plan, I disagree with your plan and housing numbers proposed because:

- 1 a) housing numbers are excessive and wrong relative to forecast calculated by ONS,
- 2 b) impact on Berkhamsted is disproportionate,
- 3 c) building on green belt does not support "conserving and protecting the natural environment"
- 4 d) 830 new homes accessible via Shootersway is only going to exacerbate the traffic problems on this road

I disagree with your plan. This is my feedback in response to the consultation.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1598

**Person ID** 1261849

**Full Name** Donald Joyce

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This is to let you know that I do not agree with the Berkhamsted Local Plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1600
<b>Person ID</b>	1261849
<b>Full Name</b>	Donald Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I believe the housing numbers proposed are excessive.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1601
<b>Person ID</b>	1261849
<b>Full Name</b>	Donald Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I believe the impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate and does not consider the existing and recent major developments in the area (Bearroc). The existing developments are already severely impacting infrastructure, pollution, congestion, road safety, local ecology and the health and well being of local residents including myself. In particular shootersway with its narrow pavements is not safe for my children walking to school and there are not enough access points onto the A41 for cars.</p> <p>I am a resident (address removed)</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1623
<b>Person ID</b>	1262282
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa Rowe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1262276
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Giulia Bunting
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Policy SP20 Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted</b> BFI supports the inclusion of the British Film Institute site at Kingshill Way (ref. Bk02) as part of the South Berkhamsted Growth Area, on the basis this is a deliverable site within the Plan period.</p> <p><b>Paras 23.110 - 23.113 Growth Areas</b> It is intended that the Growth Areas will be brought forward in a comprehensive, cohesive and co-ordinated manner, including the co-ordination of infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Policy SP21 Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted</b> Policy SP21 states that the Council will prepare a Masterplan, to be adopted as an SPD, working in collaboration with landowners, key partners and subject to consultation.</p>

BFI appreciates the need for a co-ordinated approach to delivering housing growth in Berkhamsted together with associated infrastructure. However, it is noted that the draft allocated sites within the South Berkhamsted area are not only in different ownerships but in most cases physically separate from each other and in the case of the BFI site, by existing built development, roads and open spaces.

In this context BFI considers that any Masterplan needs to recognise that individual owners are likely to bring forward their sites at different times and that development of individual sites will come forward in a phased manner. Flexibility is thus required to facilitate this and ensure the delivery of individual sites is not delayed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1685

**Person ID** 1165136

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs J.D Battye

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

TOPOGRAPHY.

2.13 admits that “the hilly nature of parts of the Borough can deter walking and, particularly, cycling. “ Int.SA p.22 says ”Local topography can influence levels of walking and cycling.”

In the particular case of Berkhamsted little account has been taken of the peculiar topography of the town. There is very little space for development, let alone the provision of adequate public open spaces, sports and leisure facilities in the valley bottom and the valley sides are similarly constrained; street parking is an unfortunate necessity; there is a single, semi- adequate direct east-west route and the steep inclines from the centre to both north and south on inadequate roads mitigate against any proposals for a reduction in vehicular traffic(see also later) in favour of more sustainable forms of transport. The WCML also presents an obstacle for all traffic to cross from north to south(or v.v.) in the centre of the town.



Any plan to increase the provision of new homes in Tring and Berkhamsted to anything more than a modest degree risks totally negating the idea of “developments acknowledging local character.” Unlike Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring are in need of conservation not regeneration and it is in any event totally questionable whether market forces will allow them to contribute as substantially to the object of the whole exercise-affordable homes.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1689

**Person ID** 1165136

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs J.D Battye

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Finally, on a particular point, has any planner tried to negotiate Bell Lane in Northchurch or even Woodlands Avenue in Berkhamsted as direct North /South routes? Have the cumulative effects of the proposed string of developments(well over half the total proposed for the town) along Shootersway and at its impact at the junction with King’s Road really been properly assessed? Are not Chesham Road and Darr’s Lane one-way for part of their length? Cross Oak Road has no pavements in parts, suffers from two existing footpaths egressing at dangerous points, and contends with the burden of rows of parked cars(a problem shared with Charles St, Shrublands Road, Beech Drive, Three Close Lane and others) at its northern end and also possesses a one-way section (DM 51,52,53)The Transport topic paper at 6.29-6.33 summarises the problems inherent in Berkhamsted. (for Tring v.6.34-6.36) Notwithstanding the long lists of problems, only 2 major improvements(out of a total of 26) are proposed-a sure indication of the intractability of the underlying constraints. In order to provide adequate infrastructure to even start to bring about safe and significant changes in modal transport in Berkhamsted and Tring it would be necessary to ban street parking in large areas of the towns and widen some streets and roads.

What is most concerning, however, is that the proposed interventions listed in the IDP fail in most cases to address the basic deficiencies of many of Berkhamsted’s and Tring’s roads, merely providing ineffective, cosmetic “improvements” at ridiculously high cost to the public purse. The locations of the required 2 primary and 1 secondary schools(23.112) need to be settled before any development is sanctioned (23.126).The junction of King’s Road and Shootersway is still

a dangerous one for traffic turning right from the former to the latter and given that Shootersway is "planned" to be the access point for nearly 800 houses and a likely route west for some of the proposed 850 houses in South Berkhamsted, the problem there is critical. The present layout at Northchurch retail area is often chaotic (23.118)

Please note that we are only qualified to write of Berkhamsted but there will be many similar problems and examples elsewhere throughout the borough and the plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1701

**Person ID** 398895

**Full Name** Mrs Sheila Bamforth

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I disagree with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed, for Berkhamsted.  
 1. The housing numbers in the Local Plan across Dacorum, and therefore Berkhamsted are excessive and wrong. They are well above the forecast housing need for the Borough as calculated by the ONS!  
 2. The impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate, does not consider existing and major development in the area (Bearroc) and severely impacts infrastructure (roads, schools etc.), pollution, congestion, road safety, local ecology, health and wellbeing of local residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1714

**Person ID** 223955

**Full Name** Mrs Christine Widdows Doughty

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to:</p> <p>Oppose the use of Green Belt land as proposed by the Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038</p> <p>Question the need for such a large number of addition houses to be built generally in Dacorum and specifically in Berkhamsted</p> <p>Request that in order to prepare a Local Plan fit for use until 2038, Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) rethink the Local Plan in light of the Covid 19 Pandemic and the recently revised government algorithms used to calculate proposed housing needs.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1718
<b>Person ID</b>	223955
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Widdows Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>HOUSING NUMBERS</b></p> <p>The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy section of the Local Plan praises Berkhamsted as an <i>“attractive valley town, with a rich built heritage surrounded by the Chilterns AONB”</i> (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). Despite this, the Local Plan is proposing building massive numbers of new houses.</p> <p>It doesn't make sense to use 7 year old data (ONS Office of National Statistics 2014) to project housing needs when there is more recent data available (ONS 2018).</p>

The algorithm used to project housing need was updated whilst the Dacorum Local Plan Consultation document was being prepared. The projected housing figures could and should have been amended to reflect the latest government guidelines. Using outdated algorithms and statistics renders the Local Plan unfit for purpose.

Building large new communities in any town changes the nature of that town. Berkhamsted is no exception. Constructing so many new houses (greatly though some of them may be needed) will destroy the town. It will no longer be the “*attractive valley town*” of which Dacorum is so proud.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1727

**Person ID** 1147853

**Full Name** Geraldine Benson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** There are many other issues including the sustainable transport issue. Berkhamsted already has a congestion problem and building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the main facilities will exacerbate problems. In addition, taking away greenbelt land also robs the community of an important health resource, and of farmland that contributes food supplies to the area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1732

**Person ID** 1147853

**Full Name** Geraldine Benson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There are also infrastructure issues which it fails to address, including traffic, water and wastewater all of which are especially the case in Berkhamsted.  So if all the above reasons I would ask that you reconsider and produce a strategy which is fairer to the people of Berkhamsted and Tring.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1743
<b>Person ID</b>	1262362
<b>Full Name</b>	Inderjit
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	It will <u>destroy the 'Market Town'</u> appeal Berkhamsted has today placing not only a huge <u>burden on the infrastructure</u> of the town and resources, but also <u>lower the quality of life</u> for existing residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1745
<b>Person ID</b>	1262362
<b>Full Name</b>	Inderjit
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The <u>traffic</u> to get to schools and work in the morning is already out of control and this is adding to the problem. People live and move to Berkhamsted because of how it is, not the monstrosity you are planning!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1748
<b>Person ID</b>	1262362
<b>Full Name</b>	Inderjit
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We have had lots of development in the area with all our <u>green spaces being consumed</u> impacting our local ecosystem.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1749
<b>Person ID</b>	1261938
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Preedy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to raise my disagreement with the proposed plans in Berkhamsted. I don't believe the proposed plans with regards to the housing development location will work due to the access to and from. The access now along Shooterway is currently not able to cope with traffic, with the current resident in the area. Traffic currently gets congested from the roundabout by Ashlins school to cross oaks and beyond. I believe if there were more residents in the area this could develop even further and cause even more damage to the road which are already suffering, from the constant use. There are already a number of large pot holes which have developed over the last few months which haven't been dealt with.</p> <p>I believe if more house are developed, this would also bring more pollution to Berkhamsted as more people would be driving in and around the area.</p> <p>Parking is already a major issue in Berkhamsted due to not enough space being available, with this only becoming worse if a large amount of residents were to move to the area.</p> <p>Access for development would also be limited to the area proposed as there is not large enough roads for big lorries to be able to enter the sight as well as leave. This would cause a large amount of traffic as they would not only slow traffic down in and around the area but also would cause more damage to the road, as they are not able to take the extra load caused but these.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1763
<b>Person ID</b>	406469
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Stephen Douglas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too many houses
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1771
<b>Person ID</b>	1262372
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Reffell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a local resident I feel I am able to raise specific concerns to the planned addition of 830 houses into the immediate vicinity of Berkhamsted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure of traffic Shootersway/Kingshill Way is <u>already a safety concern</u> as drivers frequently disregard proximately to pedestrians and cyclists alike. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used as a cut through to and from the A41.</li> <li>• Traffic is either moving at <u>excessive speed or queuing</u> due to sheer volume</li> <li>• <u>Pavements are limited and it is dangerous</u> for the many children that already walk to school or to school buses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Potential parking spill over onto local roads – new developments do not always provide adequate parking.</li> <li>• Local NHS services, schools and transport links are already under pressure, without the volume of households envisaged.</li> <li>• More loss of greenbelt land and erosion of Chiltern Hills Heritage.</li> <li>• Attack on indigenous wildlife, hedgerows and the countryside and increased pollution to what remains.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1773



<b>Person ID</b>	1262373
<b>Full Name</b>	MR JONATHAN KINGSHOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to confirm that I strongly disagree with the proposed housing numbers under Local Plan for Dacorum and in particular Berkhamsted.</p> <p>They are well above the forecast housing needs according to the office of national statistics and will severely impact infrastructures such as roads, schools, trains, car parks, healthcare etc.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that all objections will be taken into consideration in the consultation process.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1789
<b>Person ID</b>	1262380
<b>Full Name</b>	PAT HOWE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted and find the new plans absolutely awful, it's not going to be Berkhamsted, eventually it will lose its small town look, + in time I can see Berkhamsted council/Dacorum will all be renamed and no locals sitting on the council, as it will be too big, it will be run like any "big business" not being advised what is going on, and all their glossy look at how "New developments" will look won't come out like that. Sorry if this goes ahead I won't vote for any candidate in the next election.</p> <p>Please stop this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1790
<b>Person ID</b>	1262381
<b>Full Name</b>	MR DAVID BAILEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted, not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS1793
<b>Person ID</b>	1262385
<b>Full Name</b>	MR ALAN CLARK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I will need a reply please. Because lets face it anybody that comes under Dacorum. Not a lot of people trust you to do anything that is for the good for Dacorum.</p> <p>Reply please to make sure my voice is heard .</p> <p>I DO NOT SUPPORT THAKEHAM/FAKEHAM,S/ DACORUMS PROPOSALS IN ANY WAY SHAPE OR FORM.</p> <p>please reply or do i need to put my response in writing to get a response.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1795
<b>Person ID</b>	1262386
<b>Full Name</b>	MR PETER MARTIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm objecting to the amount of housing proposed for the Tring and Berkhamsted areas, it is a ridiculous amount to add on to our lovely town, my main concerns are our beautiful land will disappear for good, it will affect the wildlife which is</p>

already disappearing fast! more housing will mean more vehicles, more pollution, more crime, a picturesque market town like these should be left alone and not be allowed to be built on green belt land anyway, please reconsider, thank you

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1820

**Person ID** 1262358

**Full Name** Jennifer Scott

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I support BRAGs stance on this topic:

Given the housing targets promote a dangerously flawed starting point and DBC's vision for Berkhamsted is contrary to the health and wellbeing of current and future residents, BRAG finds it impossible it impossible to agree in any way with DBC's Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy.

In short, this is a strategy that prioritises developer lead demand over protection of the Green Belt or the health and wellbeing of both current and future residents.

Policy SP1 really isn't worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Masterplans to the detriment of both the development and community , while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as "successful new communities", "best approach to", "best practice", "comprehensive green infrastructure", "multifunctional space", "an exemplar in sustainable living" etc. etc. etc.

BRAG particularly takes issue with "5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy."

As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted, while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport.

Likewise, "6.an exemplar in sustainable living with a particular focus on reducing energy

consumption as well as generating energy from renewable and low carbon sources and delivering other significant environmental enhancement to ensure climate resilience” is simply an aspirational mantra with no hard and fast policy to back it up. All new developments need to be carbon neutral and anything less is failing to display any serious commitment to overall carbon reductions. And then point 7 assures us that DBC will “deliver the infrastructure requirements set out in the Dacorum Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Berkhamsted”. Unfortunately, there is nothing in this plan that suggests the infrastructure issues will be addressed and BRAG points to its response to section 10 (Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1841

**Person ID** 1144888

**Full Name** Mr Christopher Wheeler

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The part of the local reality I am most familiar with (because I live there) is the area around Shootersway in Berkhamsted. The plan makes appropriate noises about ensuring that infrastructure keeps pace with new residential building, but will it/can it? Some of the present infrastructure is open to expansion, albeit not always without creating fresh pressure points, but there are some obstinate physical constraints. Shootersway itself is already, at certain times during the day, congested (pre- and presumably post-Covid), and the development of Bearroc Park phase II is still under construction, still to feed its drivers on to the road. I calculate that the plan envisages nearly 500 new households directly needing to use Shootersway on a daily basis, and well over a thousand close enough (Haslam playing fields across to the development south of Ashlyns School) to want occasional use.

I am unpersuaded that the scale and nature of the proposed new development is either appropriate or sustainable. I cannot support it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS1854
<b>Person ID</b>	1262477
<b>Full Name</b>	Olivia Trodd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the above plan for the following reasons -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The plan are building too many houses in Berkhamsted where there are a finite amount of job which will then increase the need for commuting. This will impact the local environment, roads and also increase pollution and therefore worsening climate change.</li> <li>2 The houses are being built on green belt areas when there are brownfield sites that could be used instead.</li> <li>3 The sheer scale of the development in Berkhamsted will dramatically alter the town whilst not providing truly affordable housing. There is insufficient infrastructure for these including limited local health services and access to hospitals. There is no significant proposals to improvement to roads and traffic flow when there is always issues with this.</li> <li>4 The number houses was decided before the government changed its strategy and Dacorum have not changed the plans enough to reflect this.</li> <li>5 The countryside will be decimated with these large scale developments. This will affect the local environment and also the local wildlife. The wildlife corridor will be totally insufficient and lead to a decline in local wildlife when we should be prioritising this.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1857
<b>Person ID</b>	1262479
<b>Full Name</b>	Lyndsey Abercromby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to register my objection to the plan as it stands. From what I can see the plan, while well intentioned, is based on what appears to be very questionable data and outdated perspectives on the world. Building on green space should only take place as a last resort (as stated in the plan), and from the information provided I can not see that this is reflected in the plans put forward. There are local brownfield sites that rumour has it could be developed for housing but these seem caught up in bureaucracy and red tape, priority should be given to developing these areas (e.g. the proposed Lidl site and surrounding land in Northchurch). I see insufficient evidence that the local infrastructure can absorb the additional pressure this number of houses will add, some roads leading to planned developments are only wide enough to allow cars to pass at certain places, these roads will not accommodate an increase in traffic. I also can not see that any account has been taken to changes in how we live and work that have, and are projected to, occurred as a result of the current pandemic. It is clear this is being considered in other areas, and I believe this should be taken into account here.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1859
<b>Person ID</b>	1262480
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Ian Johnston
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to object to the proposals to designate additional sites in Berkhamsted for house building on the following grounds:  1) Berkhamsted has insufficient water to supply additional houses. The Secretary of State for the Environment has designated this an Area Under Severe Water Stress. The River Bulbourne regularly dries up during spells of low rainfall, with a damaging effect upon local wildlife.

2) The Economic Statistics Centre of Excellence recently estimated that the population of the United Kingdom has reduced by 1.3 million since the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, including a 700,000 reduction in the population of London. This must reduce any need to build commuter dormitories in Berkhamsted.

3) An economic recession is an inevitable consequence of lockdown; it could be severe and prolonged. This could significantly reduce the demand for expensive houses. Developers might abandon unprofitable sites in a derelict condition, or unsaleable houses might be constructed and left unoccupied.

In conclusion: I contend that it is impossible in these uncertain times to predict local housing need or demand, but it can be stated with confidence that Berkhamsted does not have enough water to supply additional houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1860

**Person ID** 1262482

**Full Name** Mr Adam Townsend

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.

I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.

These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted , not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS1893
<b>Person ID</b>	1262540
<b>Full Name</b>	Bruce Merrett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I disagree with the local plan and the housing numbers proposed. Shootersway is already subject to too much traffic, often driven at excessive speeds.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1900
<b>Person ID</b>	1154014
<b>Full Name</b>	JAMES ROTHNIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to oppose the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed. This is in excess of requirements and nex housing has already been built in the town. The infrastructure and environment should not take any more.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS1926
<b>Person ID</b>	1262553
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Wallis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1938
<b>Person ID</b>	1145427
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Glenister
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><u>BK 01 - South Berkhamsted - Swingate Lane</u></b></p> <p>I would like to object to the proposed housing development on south Berhamsted Greenbelt land for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed building site in South Berkhamsted is situated on arable farmland, levelling plateau above the steep sided valley. There are no rivers in this area presenting a major sustainability problem with regards supply of adequate water (potable drinking water &amp; wastewater) for such a large number of proposed houses. Presumably water would need to be pumped to the areas which is clearly not sustainable.</li> </ul>

- A significant loss of Green Belt here would create urban sprawl, contrary to one of the main purposes of the Green Belt. Currently there is a strong Green Belt boundary which forms a clearly defined and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, this site contributes to one of the primary purposes of the Green Belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment. An imp
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.
- Road access to the site is not suitable for such a large number of houses. There will be congestion due to schools at each end of Swingate Lane and limited or no parking area.
- Much of the development here would be highly visible, being on a prominent ridge top location. In particular it is likely to be visible from the AONB, affecting its setting.
- Development of this site will result in the loss of cultivated arable farmland. We need all the farmland to grow crops and be self-sufficient especially now that we are no longer part of the European Union as from 1st January 2021.
- The site is greenfield and there would therefore be loss or damage of some habitats. The site also includes Long Green wildlife site, which could be adversely affected by development. A designated wildlife site (woodland) is located in the south-eastern corner of the site, adjacent to the A41. There are TPOs located in the north-eastern area of the site.
- This site is located along way (2 km) from the train station, bus stops and town centre though the gradient between the town centre and the site is likely to discourage walking and cycling, which could result in increased car use and growth in the level of greenhouse gas emissions. Whilst the site is situated 2km of the railway station there remains the likelihood that a proportion will commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car.
- The site has a poor relationship to existing town centre services and facilities, employment land and the railway station. The distance from the town centre and the ridge top location would discourage walking and cycling. Consequently, large-scale development would place significant pressure on the local highway network, particularly Swing Gate Lane, the Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction and Kings Road, especially given the possible cumulative impact of existing and other promoted development. Such cumulative development will also have a significant

impact on the A41, which currently experience serious congestion during peak periods at the M25 junction and the exit at Aylesbury.

- The proposal purports to offer an opportunity to create a new planned neighbourhood expansion of the town with a range of associated local services and facilities. But the proposed local store and pub are likely to prove unviable. Neither is the proposed development of a size that would have the potential to secure a range of social, leisure and community facilities. It would form an estate dominated by commuters a high proportion of whom would commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car, making a limited contribution to enhancing a sustainable and vibrant market town.
- The site is not of a size to deliver larger-scale infrastructure, contributing to the improvement of transport links. The creation of an east-west link road (connecting Swing Gate Lane with Chesham Road) would not benefit the wider community. At the Core Strategy Hearing the Inspector accepted that this link was simply required to facilitate the proposed new development and could not be taken as a benefit for the community as a whole. It would facilitate access to the A41 from this site and thereby exacerbate the congestion problems on the A41.
- The suggestion of a bus loop would not be viable; bus routes in Berkhamsted have declined in recent years.
- A new primary school on this site does not fit with the existing provision for new schools in the present Plan.
- There would be loss or damage to habitats, such as the Long Green and Brickhill Green wildlife sites. Development of this site threatens ancient woodland (Long Green).
- The density of 35 dwellings per hectare (dph) is too high for the edge-of-town and is incompatible with neighbouring character areas.
- The western part of the site is located in the Ashlyn's Hall estate which is of local value as a heritage asset with the Grade II Listed Buildings associated with Ashlyn's Hall being in close proximity. The County Archaeologist has identified that there is potential that archaeological remains are present in the area between the A41 and Berkhamsted, including the possibility of nationally important remains that may be worthy of preservation in situ. Archaeological assessment would therefore be required before the submission of a planning application.

- Development of this site would expand Berkhamsted into countryside on the upper valley side and could impact on the Green Gateway into the town. There could be a possible impact on the transition area from urban to countryside. The site is located at the top of a steep gradient and is rated as having moderate-high susceptibility to landscape change.
- The proposed site is very near a busy dual carriage way A41 Bypass and would be very noisy for a housing estate and present a problem of air pollution, health and wellbeing.
- Development of this site would result in a loss of greenfield land and would result in soil sealing. The site is located on Grade 3 agricultural land.
  - Housing development in Dacorum needs to be re-evaluated post COVID-19. Consideration should be given to brown field sites due to the large quantity of real estate that could be reallocated and converted for the purposes of housing development. This has not been considered in the plan. It most certainly should be undertaken before any consideration is given to building on green belt land.
- Dacorum Borough Council Urban Nature Conservation Study which includes Berkhamsted (March 2006) recommends the protection of South Berkhamsted land.

Conclusions of this study support the retention of South Berkhamsted Green Belt for environmental and nature purposes

- “The urban biodiversity of the six major settlements in Dacorum needs to be considered with respect to the nature of the ecological resources of the Borough as a whole and their immediate hinterland. The ecological networks and processes that exist at the broad scale are important in helping sustain the habitats and wildlife within the urban areas and are also important in providing additional resources that can be accessed by local communities.
- The pattern of biodiversity resources within urban areas should be developed and maintained. These include those with statutory and non-statutory designations as well as sites or features of more local importance, including Open Land designated within the Local Plan.
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves and Wildlife Sites should be protected from adverse development appropriate to their status. The maintenance and enhancement of these assets will be encouraged through management. Ultimately these are the most intrinsically valuable wildlife resources and represent critical capital within the urban context.
- Locally valuable ‘Wild space’ areas should be protected, particularly where consistent with Open Land designated within the Local Plan. Management should seek to enhance their ecological interest. These sites provide the wildlife corridors, networks and stepping stones that help sustain ecological processes within the settlement. Although they can vary in size and ecological function, where appropriate the protection of corridor features should include the standard guidance provided by British Standard 5837:2005 in relation to trees and advice from the Environment

Agency concerning wetlands. The remaining areas of designated Open Land may also be important or potentially so ecologically.

- Links to open countryside and other recognised sites of wildlife value should be protected and enhanced with appropriate management where possible. These help to sustain the ecological processes to and from the settlement itself, as wildlife does not stop at the edge of a settlement boundary.
- New sites should be enhanced or created for their wildlife value where appropriate, especially where consistent with Open Land. These can help to offset areas of deficiency or improve public accessibility.
- All opportunities for Local Nature Reserve designation should be explored and suitable sites designated to help towards meeting English Nature's target for their provision.
- Finer grained wildlife support should be developed and maintained using the 'Greenspace Factor' principle and policies to protect and / or plant trees, hedgerows and other vegetation, which will contribute to the delivery of sustainable development.
- The principles of sustainable development should be followed across the borough with respect to biodiversity resources, including opportunities to address deficiencies through planning gain."

### **Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019), Section 13: Protecting Green Belt Land (Page 40)**

**Clause 136 - 139** states "Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes in Green Belt Boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified needs for development. This will be assessed through the examination of its strategic policies which will consider the preceding paragraph, and whether the strategy is;

- 1 a) making as much use as possible of suitable brown field sites and underutilised land;
- 2 b) optimise the density of development .....
- 3 c) discussion with neighbouring authorities on whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development "

### **Latest Central Government guidance - 16th December 2020**

On Wednesday 16 December 2020 the government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%.

Government also said "More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." and they went on to say "Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what

constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."

### **CONCLUSION**

The site cannot and should not be considered as either a site allocation in the core strategy nor for a development proposal of this (or any) size, as it contradicts both existing plans and the emerging core strategy and their assumed principles of sustainable development.

Government is still working on the Planning Reforms proposed in the recent White Paper 2020: Planning for the Future and the outcomes of the Public Consultation on that policy. This is particularly relevant to calculation of housing needs, location of these and protection of Green Belt and AONB. It therefore seems premature for Dacorum Borough Council to issue a Local Plan until Government conclusions are reached. It would seem that Dacorum Borough Council should develop a plan based upon 'need' rather than using the standard method figure as a target that must be achieved at all costs. The implication of this on building on Green Belt Land are therefore of paramount importance.

The housing development of 800 houses will cause congestion, increase in traffic and parking in central Berkhamsted which is already "bursting at the seams" with traffic build up in both directions of the high street at peak times. Infrastructure is already at bursting point with already strained local services, in particular schools which are already over-subscribed but also doctors surgeries, dentists and rail services. Water shortages in the town and the surrounding areas, and of pressures on the old, existing sewerage system will not be able to cope with such a largescale housing development

The above points must be fully considered to support the recommendation to remove South Berkhamsted from the Local Plan with respect to a Housing Development. The land should instead be retained as arable farmland for agriculture and sustainability purposes and maintaining its overarching important role as Green Belt.

Finally, circumstances have significantly changed since the Covid-19 Pandemic, the resulting implications of employment, place of work, surplus retail & office real estate and the local economy in the Borough of Dacorum needs to be taken fully into account. The current plan is therefore out of date and needs to be re-evaluated taking these important developments into account.

### **Bk09 Land at Bank Mill Lane**

This area is a critical flood plain for Berkhamsted. Building house on this land will be catastrophic.

It is also an important natural habitat area for birds and mammals in close proximity oth the Bulbourne River.

Humans should be in touch with our natual ecosytems and denying other species of a natural habitat will cause an inbalance that will be to the detriment of all in the long term.

Walking along Mill Lane is currnetly a desirable place for walkers in close proximity to the town away from traffic. This needs to be maintained for health and well being of residents and visitors to Berkhamsted.

Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons

- Encroachment of the urban area along the valley bottom and into adjoining open countryside.

- Distance from the town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.
- Impact on setting of the River Bulbourne.
- Reduction in the degree of separation between the town and Bourne End In addition BRAG makes the following objections
- Expansion of town to east – would significantly alter Gateway to Berkhamsted ▪ Located in Berkhamsted Conservation Area
- Impact on adjacent AONB
- Risk of flooding identified in assessment ▪ Distance from town centre – walking or cycling route to town adversely affected by any additional traffic to/from South Berkhamsted

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1942

**Person ID** 1262244

**Full Name** Estelle Wraight

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Do not build on Green Land!!! This is destroying Berkhamsted and this whole plan should be done by postal consultation at a different time that in a country lockdown, when people can honestly think about the impact of it all on their children's future town!!

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1969



<b>Person ID</b>	1262696
<b>Full Name</b>	Dan Vials
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted , not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1979
<b>Person ID</b>	1262704
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne and Colin Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed targets for building in Berkhamsted are far too high and go beyond demonstrable need.</p> <p>There is much more need for affordable housing which features very low on the present consultation plans.</p> <p>Brownfield land away from the Green Belt must be used to provide reasonable development.</p> <p>Berkhamsted cannot accommodate more traffic which would necessarily arise from the huge numbers of houses being proposed.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2037
<b>Person ID</b>	1262604
<b>Full Name</b>	Ray Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.102 Where is the current shortfall in Berkhamsted's green space? Infrastructure shortcomings for the existing population should be addressed, but making those road improvements and provision of green space dependent on over population makes no sense.</p> <p>There is no mention of Northchurch's historic centre, which predates Berkhamsted by a couple of centuries. Dacorum makes clear that Berkhamsted and Northchurch are being used to fulfil its own ambitions, rather than the actual needs of local people.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2072
<b>Person ID</b>	493974
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Gillian Bailey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I disagree with the Local Plan proposals because:</p> <p>West Berkhamsted is already being developed by major projects (e.g. Phases 1 and 2 at Bearroc Park) with no provision for local facilities including schools, roads, medical requirements, pollution levels and road safety and congestion.</p> <p>Proposed developments are on Green Belt land, or land designated as open space and this green environment MUST be preserved to prevent Berkhamsted becoming a concrete jungle.</p> <p>Please protect our town and reject this proposal.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2074
<b>Person ID</b>	1262743
<b>Full Name</b>	Roger Hester
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I totally disagree with the proposal to build such a large number of new houses in Berkhamsted. To do so would dramatically change the character of our delightful, small Market Town. The local infrastructure would be overwhelmed.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2097
<b>Person ID</b>	1262784
<b>Full Name</b>	MR JEFF PEARSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>I most certainly do not support this scheme [Thakeham]</b> along with other planning applications to build new houses in south Berkhamsted, as these projects would totally ruin the surrounding countryside and make local residents lives an absolute misery for the next 10 years!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2103
<b>Person ID</b>	1253932
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Scrivens
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I'm writing to record my views and objections to the Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038). I've studied the plans, and as. long-term resident of Berkhamsted can say that the plans for the town are ill-conceived for several reasons.

I've submitted my comments via the Consultation portal in addition, but feel it important to collect my objections together in one statement too:

My first objection is on the basis of ecological and climate grounds. The developments proposed around the south of Berkhamsted will destroy vast amounts of Green Belt. **The Council appears to have failed to take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints; including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB.** This is land that once built on will never be returned to a natural state - something that we can ill afford as we struggle against the changes in our climate. Any plan that is made to provide new housing must guarantee the protection of existing natural habits and creation of new ones. The current plans do not do this.

In addition, this area of Green Belt provides a degree of protection to the town by absorbing pollution from the A41. Beyond this, it provides health benefits to the population by providing natural environments to exercise in - something which has proven essential throughout 2020. The proposed area of development to the south east of Berkhamsted is also productively farmed, another reason why this area should not be considered for property development.

Developing on Green Belt is also in contradiction to national Government policy and as a result the Dacorum plan should be reconsidered to look for alternatives on existing Brownfield sites. There are already many sites that can be considered across the borough, and the likely changing nature of commercial property use in the coming years, increased by changing behaviours post-Covid will afford more.

My second reason for objection is the lack of planning or detail which has been considered for the infrastructure of the town and the burden these new houses will place on it. The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed. The proposals do not include suitable provision for affordable housing, something which is already a problem in this part of the borough.

**In addition there are already poor public transport links within the town, and the proposals do nothing to improve them.** Connected to this objection are my concerns regarding the use that existing roads will suffer. Many of the connecting roads between the valley (A4251) and the new houses and the A41 will become busy rat-runs, raising pollution levels and introducing more road-safety risks in residential areas. Swing Gate Lane is a perfect example of a problem that these proposals will create. That road will become a rat-run connecting route to the A41, avoiding the town centre. It currently runs past 2 schools and a play area, and is already over-parked. These plans as I've interpreted them do not improve the safety or environment of the rest of the town.

Beyond these specific reasons for objection to the proposals, I also question the basis on which they have all been made. The national government guidance has been inconsistent in the past 6 months, which is enough reason to re-assess the requirements for housing growth across the borough. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them.

By your own admission in the Plan there are "uncertainties over using this as our housing figure" **Any proposal of such significance for the Borough should not be made on uncertain estimates or assumptions.**

As you admit yourselves a "further refinement to the process of calculating housing need" is required, and I urge you to do this before progressing any further.

I trust that these objections will be duly noted and considered with all the other objections that I expect you to receive from across the borough. I urge you to reconsider the plans you're making with consideration of all the above points.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2127

**Person ID** 1262809

**Full Name** JUDITH HONOUR

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my extreme concern and disagreement regarding the proposed new housing, sports centre and school developments planned for Berkhamsted. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 54 years and have seen the huge expansion of Berkhamsted over this time and am totally distraught at all of the new development proposals planned. Having witnessed the recent Bearoc Park development and the affect this has had on the local roads and the crowding this has created, it is really upsetting to hear of new developments which will build on our beautiful green fields, many of which I have regularly gone for lovely countryside walks across.

Berkhamsted is a beautiful market town surrounded by green belt countryside, which is now being ruined by all these proposed and current developments. We cannot take any more. At peak times the traffic in the High Street is at a logjam with queues way back out of the main parts of the town.

This is now taking away our green belt land and will completely kill the character of Berkhamsted.

I beg you to not approve these proposals as enough is enough (I am so upset by the sheer numbers of these proposed developments that I struggle to sleep and am writing this through tears). This to me, my local friends, family and neighbours is a complete nightmare.

Please, please save our Berkhamsted countryside, we cannot lose any more.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2155

**Person ID** 1144389

**Full Name** Mrs Sarah Tester

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing, once again, to voice my concerns over the planned development of Berkhamsted. Having read through all the documentation I fully support and re iterate the BRAG response. I also have issues that have been further highlighted throughout the pandemic. Healthy communities need space to make the most of the mental well being provided by being outdoors. We are particularly fortunate to be designated an area of out standing natural beauty. As a mother and grandmother, I am horrified that the loss of our existing open spaces and foot path routes to development on this scale will mean families are crammed into a small market town. Already congested, the school run will become an even more stressful daily chore, if places at schools are in fact available. Queuing cars in kings road trying to get to Waitrose at Christmas time will become dangerous, and general travelling from a to b through our narrow roads and lanes is going to cause congestion beyond imagination. What is the impact on local wildlife and how many farms are we going to lose.

I appreciate that more houses are needed, and the amount proposed for Berkhamsted represents a whole new community in itself. I do not understand why a new community could not be built at Cow Roast which has the space for all the necessary infrastructure, access to the a41 without having to come through Berkhamsted and be small enough to maintain a rural lifestyle. Surely the hilly nature of the Berkhamsted landscape is going to be costly...Cow Roast is flat and I am sure local residents would benefit from the new infrastructure as well as the opportunity to re open the only pub.

Cow Roast may not be the most financially attractive to developers but the human side of this strategy is far more important than profit.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS2160
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2180
<b>Person ID</b>	1262762
<b>Full Name</b>	Eric Dodman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2207



<b>Person ID</b>	1262841
<b>Full Name</b>	Nada Ryan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF). The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2216
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted delivery strategy. Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially in Berkhamsted and Tring over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led (which is disgraceful who are the developers bribing to get such a dreadful plan passed) and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2304
<b>Person ID</b>	610662
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Antony Harbidge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the housing targets promote a dangerously flawed starting point and DBC’s vision for Berkhamsted is contrary to the health and wellbeing of current and future residents, BRAG finds it impossible to agree in any way with DBC’s Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy.</p> <p>In short, this is a strategy that prioritises developer lead demand over protection of the Green Belt or the health and wellbeing of both current and future residents.</p> <p>Policy SP1 really isn’t worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Masterplans to the detriment of both the development and community , while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as “<i>successful new communities</i>”, “<i>best approach to</i>”, “<i>best practice</i>”, “<i>comprehensive green infrastructure</i>”, “<i>multifunctional space</i>”, “<i>an exemplar in sustainable living</i>” etc. etc. etc.</p> <p>BRAG particularly takes issue with “<i>5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy.</i>”</p> <p>As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted, while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport.</p> <p>Likewise, “<i>6.an exemplar in sustainable living with a particular focus on reducing energy consumption as well as generating energy from renewable and low carbon sources and delivering other significant environmental enhancement to ensure climate resilience</i>” is simply an aspirational mantra with no hard and fast policy to back it up. All new developments need to be carbon neutral and anything less is failing to display any serious commitment to overall carbon reductions.</p>

And then point 7 assures us that DBC will “*deliver the infrastructure requirements set out in the Dacorum Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Berkhamsted*”. Unfortunately, there is nothing in this plan that suggests the infrastructure issues will be addressed and BRAG points to its response to section 10 (Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2305

**Person ID** 488516

**Full Name** mr hugh siegle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The Council recognise the constraints and deficiencies which exist in the linear nature of the Town, its valley sides and dense centre, but ignore the limited accessibility on many roads which are used as short-cuts or rat-runs to avoid congestion hot spots. Most of the proposed Green Belt growth areas front on to narrow busy roads with limited opportunity for physical improvements.

It is not clear how sustainable transport improvements can be made, in particular improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It appears growth has been planned on the basis of street maps and aerial photographs, rather than understanding the physical constraints that exist on the ground.

What is proposed is not sustainable nor justified and will have a seriously detrimental impact on this historic market town. The existing Core Strategy may require updating but this does not explain why the Council has made a complete policy change in respect of the Green Belt and its protection. In preparing the Core Strategy the Council was also under pressure to promote more development than it felt appropriate for the Borough and fought hard to protect its position, including facing down a judicial review. In not making a robust defence of the Green Belt and other constraints the Council has let down the Borough's residents

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2334

<b>Person ID</b>	1262984
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah O'Sullivan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.</p> <p>This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.</p> <p>The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2358
<b>Person ID</b>	1261830
<b>Full Name</b>	alistair budd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It is very hard to understand how any study could conclude that a large growth in housing on the edges of a town located in a valley bottom with steep sides and already inadequate road capacity would be a good idea .</p> <p>23.119 recognises the current congestion and the lack of opportunity to significantly change the transport infrastructure .walking ,cycling and public transport options to get new homeowners into Berkhamsted or onto the A41 are not viable .</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a commuter town in the main, new residents will drive to the station or head for the main roas network at the A41 junction .Already the conjestion in a normal rush hour at the top of kings road is bad . This is a plan for gridlock , increased pollution in the valley bottom and in school playgrounds [ schools on Durrants lane and Kings road both have schools on them and are the major routes into the town centre] .</p> <p>This level of development across such a site ,on top of that which which is already planned will fundamentally change Berkhamsted for ever . It is hard to see how it will be for the better .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2427
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2559
<b>Person ID</b>	1263183

<b>Full Name</b>	Claire Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I find the transport links arguement here flawed, the trains (pre-COVID) were over-crowded and poorly run, and the town has a traffic problem. There is limited cycling infrastructure and the bus is regularly stuck in traffic. Berkhamsted does not have any sizable parks, something that is countered by the immediate access to the countryside, the more Berkhamsted sprawls, the more this becomes a problem.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2577
<b>Person ID</b>	1263140
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr B & Mrs A Goddard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1262938
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Steven Barker
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see attached statement 20107_Reps.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">20107_Reps.pdf (2)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2582

<b>Person ID</b>	1262037
<b>Full Name</b>	Jason Silver
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Building on green belt is not something that should be considered, a stronger challenging on the number of dwellings that Berkhamsted can sustain/is appropriate for the town, hence a stronger evidencial support of the proposed growth is needed
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2604
<b>Person ID</b>	1263220
<b>Full Name</b>	MR COLIN DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategic planning for Dacorum cannot go ahead as proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is provision for an unreasonable number of houses in Berkhamsted.</li> <li>• The impact on infrastructure is far too great.</li> <li>• The proposed development will impact on the green belt to an unnecessary level.</li> <li>• It will produce impossible congestion on Berkhamsted High Street.</li> <li>• There are brown field sites within Berkhamsted that can be used.</li> </ul>

- There would be severe strain on water supply and provision for extra waste water disposal would take around ten years to develop.

Local authorities have scope to restrict the scale of development that is proposed by Government due to local constrictions, e.g. Berkhamsted High Street capacity and infrastructure.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2614

**Person ID** 1263206

**Full Name** Andrew Farrow

**Organisation Details** Great Gaddesden Parish Council

**Agent ID** 1253616

**Agent Full Name** Andrew Farrow

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2625

**Person ID** 398861

**Full Name** Mrs Beverley Brookes

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We reside (address removed) and are vehemently opposed to the plan to build houses to be accessed via Shootersway. Under normal circumstances, the traffic situation is appalling – and the thought of an additional 830 houses would be sufficient to convince us to leave the area completely. The local infrastructure cannot cope with this and I am frankly aghast that this could happen – especially given the additional burden at Bearroc Park.</p> <p>Our neighbours (address removed) all feel the same way and I am sure they will be writing to oppose this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2780
<b>Person ID</b>	1262722
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin McCready
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted Town is already struggling to support the level in development. Schools are over subscribed and specifically the secondary school catchment area is reducgin and cannot service the existing town. The proposed development is completely unsustainable and will have a detrimental affect on the town, therefore destroying the very traits described in the introduction. this is complete madness!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2804
<b>Person ID</b>	1264105
<b>Full Name</b>	Ramesh Patel

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm writing to record my views and objections to the Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038). I've studied the plans, and as a long-term resident (31 years) of Berkhamsted can say that the plans for the town are ill-conceived for several reasons.</p> <p>I have submitted my comments via the Consultation portal, but feel it important to collect my objections together in one statement too:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 On the basis of ecological and climate grounds. The developments proposed around the south of Berkhamsted will destroy vast amounts of Green Belt. The Council appears to have failed to take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints; including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB. This is land that once built on will never be returned to a natural state - something that we can ill afford as we struggle against the changes in our climate. Any plan that is made to provide new housing must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones. The current plans do not do this.</li> <li>1 In addition there are already poor public transport links within the town, and the proposals do nothing to improve them. Connected to this objection are my concerns regarding the use that existing roads will suffer. Many of the connecting roads between the valley (A4251) and the new houses and the A41 will become busy rat-runs, raising pollution levels and introducing more road-safety risks in residential areas. Swing Gate Lane is a perfect example of a problem that these proposals will create. That road will become a rat-run connecting route to the A41, avoiding the town centre. It currently runs past 2 schools and a play area, and is already over-parked. These plans as I've interpreted them do not improve the safety or environment of the rest of the town.</li> <li>1 This area of Green Belt provides a degree of protection to the town by absorbing pollution from the A41. Beyond this, it provides health benefits to the population by providing natural environments to exercise in - something which</li> </ol>

has proven essential throughout 2020. The proposed area of development to the south east of Berkhamsted is also productively farmed, another reason why this area should not be considered for property development.

- 1 **Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure.** Specifically, I look at the proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted and state categorically that there is insufficient consideration in the Plan for the provision of new or of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments. Berkhamsted is already a Town which is at capacity in terms of schooling, road services, water supply and wastewater disposal.

Beyond these specific reasons for objection to the proposals, I also question the basis on which they have all been made. The national government guidance has been inconsistent in the past 6 months, which is enough reason to re-assess the requirements for housing growth across the borough. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them.

By your own admission in the Plan there are "uncertainties over using this as our housing figure" Any proposal of such significance for the Borough should not be made on uncertain estimates or assumptions.

As you admit yourselves a "further refinement to the process of calculating housing need" is required, and I urge you to do this before progressing any further.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2808
<b>Person ID</b>	1153824
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael and Susan Wright
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Our comments are broadly aligned with those of the <b>One Voice</b> alliance, in particular that other than by reference to Government targets, the need for the number of dwellings to be built has not been demonstrated. There is reference to a South West Hertfordshire housing needs assessment but no explanation of how this translates into need in Dacorum.</p> <p>The number of dwellings to be provided in Berkhamsted is disproportionate to the current size of the town when compared to Hemel Hempstead and it is not clear how the considerable expansion of infrastructure is to be achieved. Traffic volumes will increase significantly and add considerably to traffic flows in and out of the town including along narrow roads in the older parts of town.</p> <p>Any developments which expand the reach of the town in an east west direction should be resisted to guard against urban sprawl. In this respect, providing the bulk of the housing on the southern side of the town towards the A41 makes sense but the draft plan does not explain what exceptional circumstances prevail to justify building on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Affordable housing should meet the needs of those in the most acute need and high proportions of low cost home ownership schemes such as started ownership will not achieve this. The Council should insist that developers provide an appropriate amount of rented housing in addition to assisting aspiring home owners who are unable to compete in the housing market.</p> <p>Conservation areas provide a high quality environment and the Council should be vigilant in protecting them from unscrupulous developers and ill advised changes to planning law.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2812
<b>Person ID</b>	1262479
<b>Full Name</b>	Lyndsey Abercromby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to register my objection to the plan as it stands. From what I can see the plan, while well intentioned, is based on what appears to be very questionable data and outdated perspectives on the world. Building on green space should only take place as a last resort (as stated in the plan), and from the information provided I can not see that this is reflected in the plans put forward. There are local brownfield sites that rumour has it could be developed for housing but these seem caught up in bureaucracy and red tape, priority should be given to developing these areas (e.g. the proposed Lidl site and surrounding land in Northchurch). I see insufficient evidence that the local infrastructure can absorb the additional pressure this number of houses will add, some roads leading to planned developments are only wide enough to allow cars to pass at certain places, these roads will not accommodate an increase in traffic. I also can not see that any account has been taken to changes in how we live and work that have, and are projected to, occurred as a result of the current pandemic. It is clear this is being considered in other areas, and I believe this should be taken into account here.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2815
<b>Person ID</b>	223046
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Roger Petts
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to object strongly to the proposal of building more houses in Berkhamsted as part of the Local Plan. A large number of houses have recently been built including a significant number on Bearroc Park. This has caused a range of difficulties and any further building will have an even greater impact on infrastructure, congestion, pollution, and the general well-being and health of local residents.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2903
<b>Person ID</b>	1263233
<b>Full Name</b>	ALAN AND CAROLE CHURCH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The development of 850 homes on land south of Berkhamsted will result in the town effectively being joined to Bourne End creating a "string settlement" with no green space between Northcurch and the A41 Junction. Thakeham Homes' proposal citing additinal sports facilities etc. does little to mitigate the loss of valuable green belt land especially when berkhamsted is currently well-served by sports facilities. Preference/priority should be given to brownfield development in the urban area or upon the outskirts of the two to avoid further degradation of green spaces.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2917
<b>Person ID</b>	1263430
<b>Full Name</b>	Pru Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted Homes

At least 2,236 homes in Berkhamsted increases the number of dwellings in the town by over a quarter (nearly 25%). This seems an extortionate amount for what is essentially a small market town. With a population of around 20,000 currently, it could increase our urban footprint by up to a third which feels hugely excessive.

The allocation of houses feels extreme. 800 more houses are planned along Shootersway when you place all the developments together. This is a narrow, residential/country lane, which cannot support such a dramatic number of homes. Please do not widen roads and cut down historic trees either which give the road such character.

We are already in the midst of around 300+ homes being built on the Durrants road site so it takes a road which initially had around 150 houses to one that will have well over 1,000. It feels excessive. This, coupled, with the south Berkhamsted development of 850, means 1600 homes, possibly well over 5,000 people concentrated in a narrow area - where it is difficult to improve transport links.

Also, by its nature at the top of a hill, the town isn't that accessible and not everyone will walk the 20 mins down so will get into their cars to go to the town centre. Whilst a new car park has been built it will not accommodate all the new residents leading to further congestion. I also dread to think what the school run period will be like for traffic.

The main access into the town from the south side of Berkhamsted is from the A416 with its very narrow junction with Kings Road/Shootersway. This is already under pressure and a potential 1600 homes will contribute significantly to this. The access to the South Berkhamsted development will also put pressure on traffic through narrow roads of the Ashlyns Estate.

The Berkhamsted plan seems to be taking any vacant field and making sure it is filled with houses rather than giving the town 'room to breathe' on all sides of the valley.

Even though some development will have to take place, it is not obvious how the community will be enhanced. If we are to build more housing, there needs to be a proper plan on providing some extra amenities, better cycle routes.

Already it is hard to get a GP place or dentist place in the town. How is this being addressed? Also, the town's main youth activity - Raiders football - is hugely oversubscribed and it is difficult to see how they will be able to sustain new recruits in larger numbers.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2943
<b>Person ID</b>	1263377
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Messenger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2960
<b>Person ID</b>	1263438
<b>Full Name</b>	Angelika Goff
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



## **Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

In line with my earlier comment on the overall Dacorum housing 'targets', I also do not understand what the number for Berkhamsted is being based on and IMO it is far too high compared to actual predicted need and what the town can manage sustainably.

The strategy for Berkhamsted IMO goes against the overall strategy laid out earlier in this document.

*Berkhamsted:*

**23.108** *The bulk of development will chiefly be delivered as a planned new neighbourhood to the south and west of Berkhamsted.*

**23.109** *The strategic Growth Areas will be of a mix of sizes. The South Berkhamsted Growth Area is the largest of these and will enable the delivery of a full range of housing, including a significant number of much needed affordable homes, and specialist accommodation for older people*

As you rightly say, Berkhamsted has a vibrant high-street, with pretty much all commercial and leisure activity (shopping, eating/drinking out, entertainment, canal, leisure centre) as well as social & health infrastructure concentrated here, along the valley floor.

However the bulk of housing will be built in new neighbourhoods far outside of the centre, and in large parts at the top of the valley slopes. Due to distance and topography, non-walkable and non-cyclable for most people, esp. not older people. No vague commitment to 'improving walking and cycling connections throughout the town' can negate the geographic reality of Berkhamsted, esp. not if you also consider people carrying shopping, being out with children etc.

As you also pointed out, there is a high % of private car ownership and there is no reason to suggest that this would be different for the new inhabitants.

And I cannot see a credible proposal in your plan to provide public transport that is eco-friendly as well as affordable, frequent and stopping close enough to peoples' homes as well as local amenities to offer a genuine alternative to private car journeys into town. Which in turn will further congest already heavily congested roads, leading to ever more harmful emissions and the associated risk to our health and lives.

All of which is exacerbated by hugely inflated housing targets, out of step with projections and way too high for local infrastructure to keep up with, esp. given the geophysical constraints of Berkhamsted.

And so IMO the strategy for Berkhamsted does precisely nothing to address residents' concerns (as per your own quote below) and does not at all meet your declared strategy for Dacorum.

Too much housing, and too far away from local amenities meaning increased rather than reduced journeys, and no credible plan for replacing private car journeys into town with low or zero-emission alternatives.

Versus your stated vision of (to which I subscribe 100% btw):

*"Our residents have told us of their concerns over the ability of the roads to accommodate high levels of housing growth and to tackle climate change we need to significantly reduce harmful emissions and particulates from transport and at the same time greatly improve local air quality. Therefore, new development will need to be located in places which have excellent access to jobs, shops, services, can quickly and easily be reached by sustainable public transport and benefit*

*from high quality walking and cycling infrastructure. Even where journeys are made by sustainable methods it is important to minimise journey lengths, reducing demand on transport infrastructure and delivering greater health and wellbeing."*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2965

**Person ID** 1263465

**Full Name** CHARLY PRESTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have benefited from living in beautiful Berkhamsted for 18 years, my whole life in fact. I wish for my views to be recorded regarding the proposals contained within the "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)".

I wish to register a **very strong objection** to the choice of several of the development sites that are contained within the Plan. Noting I live in Berkhamsted, the prime objection is to the proposed developments within the Berkhamsted area. My objection is based upon three fundamental strategic grounds outlined below:

**Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision.** Accepting the fundamental need for more housing, in particular, genuinely affordable housing, I have major concerns regarding the enormous scale of proposed development of Dacorum, impacting the Green Belt. It is my understanding that the algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them.

**Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land.** The Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". It is evident that in meeting the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the over-inflated housing need, the Council proposes that, as a necessity, development must, therefore, take place on Green Belt land or land that is specially designated for other purposes. 85%

of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; these are for many people the prime reasons that they have chosen to live in this area.

**Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure.** Specifically, I look at the proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted and state categorically that there is not enough consideration in the Plan for the provision of new or of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments. Berkhamsted is already a Town which is at capacity in terms of schooling, road services, water supply and wastewater disposal.

I request that my objection is fully taken into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2967

**Person ID** 1263471

**Full Name** HELEN GILLETT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have benefited from living in beautiful Berkhamsted for almost 20 years. I have always taken great interest in the development of the town and particularly how it has grown to meet the housing needs within the borough. I wish for my views to be recorded regarding the proposals contained within the "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)".

I wish to register a **very strong objection** to the choice of several of the development sites that are contained within the Plan. Noting I live in Berkhamsted, the prime objection is to the proposed developments within the Berkhamsted area. My objection is based upon three fundamental strategic grounds outlined below:

**Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision.** Accepting the fundamental need for more housing, in particular, genuinely affordable housing, I have major concerns regarding the enormous scale of proposed development of Dacorum. The Council appears not to have considered the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in

Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them. The Council will undoubtedly be aware that on Wednesday 16 December 2020 the government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which is in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government also said:

"More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a **risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt**. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." They went on to say "Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."

**Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land.** The Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". It is evident that in meeting the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the over-inflated housing need, the Council proposes that, as a necessity, development must, therefore, take place on Green Belt land or land that is specially designated for other purposes. 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; these are for many people the prime reasons that they have chosen to live in this area. I remind the Council of the stance of our local Member of Parliament, Gagan Mohindra, on Green Belt land, which was included in an email response to me dated 17 November 2020. This appears to set out the Council's duty to plan for housing provision and protect our Green Belt and specially designated land:

"I stood on a platform of protecting the Green Belt and will continue to fight that battle on a national level. I have previously written to Minister Rt Hon Chris Pincher at MHCLG about my concerns. At a local level, we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents. The only way to do this is through Dacorum Borough Council finalising its Local Plan as soon as possible".

**Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure.** Specifically, I look at the proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted and state categorically that there is insufficient consideration in the Plan for the provision of new or of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments. Berkhamsted is already a Town which is at capacity in terms of schooling, road services, water supply and wastewater disposal.

I request that my objection is fully taken into account. You will undoubtedly see many more similar objections from other residents of Berkhamsted that the proposed developments within the town are wrongly premised, should not take place on Green Belt land and do not make proper provision for improved infrastructure for the town to accommodate such large developments.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2999

**Person ID** 1263478

**Full Name** ELIZABETH RAILTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Key Developments in Berkhamsted: this is where I want to make most of my comments as I have lived in Berkhamsted since 1963 and in my present home on [address removed] since 1982. [address removed] is in the conservation area and generally developments have been carefully planned in recent years ensuring, in the words of the Local Plan objectives, “an attractive and valued built and historic environment “. However, the Green Belt provides an essential aspect of the overall environment and the key developments proposed in Berkhamsted will signify erode the identity of Berkhamsted as a thriving town with an easily accessible rural hinterland that is a key part of the way of life in this community. The area on the ridge running from Shootersway across Kingshill Way and above Hall Park provides a rural buffer zone between the town and the A41 bypass and has many bridle paths and footpaths that traverse both open fields and woodlands.

In recent years new developments along Shootersway and the access routes onto the bypass have led to considerable congestion at peak times in the whole area, particularly at the roundabout at the top of Chesham Road which gives access to the bypass. It is hard to see how the system of narrow roads in that area will support the inevitable increase in traffic in that part of Berkhamsted. Several schools already generate traffic in the area and a further school is proposed as part of the necessary infrastructure to support an increased population. This is not viable. The Council makes it clear that it is not responsible for the “ provision of most types of infrastructure “ so the residents of Berkhamsted are asked to hope that the Councils “enabling” role will ensure there is appropriate provision. This subjects the current residents

of Berkhamsted to the huge risk, and given the nature of the roads in the area, that nothing will be put in place to mitigate the traffic congestion and environmental impact.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3021

**Person ID** 1263485

**Full Name** MR ANDREW REYNOLDS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I wish to object strongly regarding the housing developments in our area of Northchurch.  
Any new houses in New Road will cause massive traffic issues at the junction with the High Street. This is also 'Green belt' land and should not be developed.  
More housing in the Darrs Lane area will again cause massive congestion and again Green Belt land is being sacrificed.  
We do not have the schools, doctors surgeries and shop parking areas to accommodate more and more housing.  
This is just not the correct location for these new houses. I object most strongly to these plans.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3030

**Person ID** 1263491

**Full Name** Peter Roberts

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It appears to me that the allotments off New Road at Northchurch are to be converted to housing. I am against this as someone who cultivated one of the in the 1970's when I lived in a smaller house it is essential that they are still available with most new developments having smaller and smaller gardens.</p> <p>I am also against using Berkhamsted football ground for housing development. Moving the football pitch to Bourne End will mean everyone will be forced to go there in a car and will result in extra carbon dioxide and other pollutants from the cars, they will not be all electric for many years.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3052
<b>Person ID</b>	1261425
<b>Full Name</b>	Camilla Pascucci
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Dacorum DLP does not include strategy for providing additional employment capacity in Berkhamsted and Northchurch. With the proposed 1,800+ houses growth in just this area, we must assume that must mean more out-commuting as a percentage of population?</p> <p>Nearly all the development proposed in the Dacorum DLP will be on Greenbelt This is against Government Policy. Living in Northchurch the land between Shooters way and the A41 has always been considered as the "Green Lung" for Berkhamsted, absorbing vehicle emissions and noise from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years, which means this Green Buffer is needed more than ever.</p>

Berkhamsted lies along a valley with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides and air pollution naturally collect in the area. Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor. Excessive developments will result in poorer air quality. It is also noted that DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-1018. Air quality has not improved since then and recently significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death. Health and well-being are paramount to our communities.

Not planning for more jobs in our area will result in it becoming a dormitory/commuting town to feed the wider area. Commuting levels will increase at a higher rate than the population growth, with added journey lengths and congestion with all the problems I stated above on car usage.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3054

**Person ID** 1146084

**Full Name** Mr Jason Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.

This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.



The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3057

**Person ID** 1261883

**Full Name** Sheila Robertson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to send in my objections about the massive amount of new housing proposed in Berkhamsted. There are some green spaces planned but no extra schools, doctors surgeries etc. Traffic is already congested and the town is about to burst it's banks - so much traffic. There are no cycle paths installed along the high street to allow less traffic.

Including allotments etc with the new development past Swing Gate Lane is a nice idea but the big issue is whether Berkhamsted is now at risk of being over extended. Without lots of ways to reduce the impact of traffic in the centre there is no solution to this.

I object to all the new housing and would bring in to question the planning which says we need it. What percentage is starter homes and Social Housing that is affordable to young people in this area.

I am massively disappointed in Dacorum in supporting new housing to this scale in a small, congested town.

I would like to see a proposal for some Eco housing - Tiny Homes, or passive homes - some way of Berkhamsted leading the way in living differently and not putting more strain on our resources.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3069
<b>Person ID</b>	489025
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sarah Rees
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object to the Proposal by the South Berkhamsted Concept because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <i>Whilst the policy on biodiversity is clear, the emerging plan is not explicit enough in terms of <b>how</b> Dacorum Council will work with developers and other stakeholders to mitigate Green Belt loss, increase biodiversity and meet National and Hertfordshire's goals for climate change and carbon reduction</i></li> <li>2 <i>The proposed number of houses to be built should be significantly lower than the target to reflect <b>actual demonstrable need</b> for housing and the high proportion of Green Belt and AONB land in Dacorum, with a primary focus on affordable starter homes</i></li> <li>3 <i>A higher proportion of the houses should be built on brownfield land, or established through conversions, in the existing urban areas of Hemel Hempstead, Tring, Berkhamsted and Kings Langley, and <b>away from areas located in the Green Belt</b> (which should only be used in exceptional circumstances) and the Chilterns AONB and its setting.</i></li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3133
<b>Person ID</b>	1158207
<b>Full Name</b>	CHARLES WELBORN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal of another school and 2236 homes coming to Berkhamsted. Berkhamsted is and was a historic market town with lots of history. Over the years, the historic Berkhamsted has become spoilt due to a sheer volume developments. The developments are being granted, and eventually wildlife is also having a major decline due to the developments. Trying to reach the bypass is becoming more and more difficult due to the number of houses going up. People do not have 1 car between the houses they have more. The more cars and traffic on the roads, the more traffic congestion you get and the more polluted the air becomes. This can become dangerous to people who are elderly and to those like individuals who I know who have underlying health conditions such as Asthma. If anything we need these trees to provide Berkhamsted with the clean oxygen that us Berkhamstedians deserve. These trees have been replaced by houses like the development at Beurroc park.</p> <p>Also if the developments came, just imagine the amount of noise that would be created. We have enough noise from the bypass and do not need to have any more. Also when DBC are doing road repairs and the rubbish truck, the amount of noise is unbelievable. Adding more houses and more schools will just create more noise. This also has an impact on nature as nature doesn't like noise and they can become scared due to the volume of noise.</p> <p>For one of the local developments I noted café which would come on the development. Why would anyone want to come to a café which is out of the way of town? As well as the café, homes and other public uses this development will provide, there will only be 75 spaces. Where can the other vehicles park?</p> <p>I have also noted from the comments made by Hertfordshire Highways, "the nearest bus stop is approximately 700m from the development". As an elderly person, do you think they could walk 700m? Elderly people as they get older will be able to walk less and less not more and more.</p> <p>Another issue is that unlike other elderly developments, these houses are not built near a town. They are built away at the furthest point from the town with steep narrow roads the only access to town, making it difficult for elderly people to gain access to shops and banks as well as other local facilities.</p> <p>Due to Covid 19 a lot of businesses are going under and people are losing their jobs. If people are losing their jobs in Berkhamsted and having to search further a field due to none being available in Berkhamsted, how will adding extra people and houses help this? Also having more people will cause stress for the schools and doctors surgeries. The surgeries are getting to a point when they can not accept any more people and therefore people are having to drive</p>

further afield to go and see their Gp. This is the same for school places. The site of the proposed new school will result in children walking along a narrow and sometimes unpathed Shooters way to get to it.

I walk, cycle and drive along Shooters way regularly to access the bypass as well. Shootersway during the day is always very busy. When trying to turn out of either Oxfield or Tower close has become a waiting game due to the volume of traffic which has already increased along Shootersway. Sometimes to get out of these turnings you can be waiting for more than 5 minutes. If you have had a working day in London, that can add to the day. There are other housing developments round Berkhamsted in the pipeline and having this housing affect will just add to the pressure of the traffic. Also, during the duration of constructing the development will be a hassle for traffic with all the various lorries and building vehicles clogging up Shootersway. Children should be able to walk safely to school which is not happening due to narrow pavements.

Another problem with the traffic lights at the top of Kingshill way, is when turning right coming up from town, some people just go thinking it is green, when really, they should wait for people coming from the roundabout down into town and a lot of near misses have happened.

Another concern I do have is with these high sided vehicles such as lorries and you see it when they come down any road, is that they bang and knock tree branches down due to them being high. I feel all the trees that are along shooters way are very beneficial to all residents and members of the public due to producing enough oxygen for us to breathe. Having the houses with more cars will create more pollution.

It has also been noted as more and more houses have cropped up round Berkhamsted, the water and sewage pipes are unable to cope and therefore burst closing the road for several days if not weeks. Due to a pipe breaking on Kingshill way and the road having to be closed, traffic was diverted via the Highstreet. Also, a similar thing happened when they closed Shootersway just to resurface it. The point I am trying to make is due to both the main roads having to close, it created congestion and other problems in other parts of Berkhamsted. Looking at the map from where the junction will be it would cause complete chaos if one of these roads were to close again. This is why the development can not take place.

Berkhamsted is supposed to be a historic place.

I have noted from other websites how some birds and other animals are on the verge of being extinct. Also the greenbelt land to me makes Berkhamsted and if we are not careful people will be moving due to Berkhamsted residents not being able to get the services they require. I know some Doctors surgeries are bursting and not allowing any more patients

on. We cannot take this development as more people in Berkhamsted, the harder it will be for these resources to be used when needed essentially.

I would like to raise another issue where the figures in "housing need Statement" document demography. Where have these figures come from for older people in Dacorum?

I hope my comments along with others raised, are taken into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3194

**Person ID** 1261759

**Full Name** Lauren Higgins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I wanted to write as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically **Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.**

In addition, living currently (address removed) Berkhamsted, I am very concerned about the number of developments proposed on this side of town and the sustainability. I have two young children and often walk up and down Kings Road. There are many places where the pavement is not sufficient for a pushchair (let alone a wheelchair). I have to go into the road with my pushchair in a few places, which is not the safest option but the only way to walk. For this reason, not many people walk and that can't be a good thing if we are trying to lower environmental impact. There are also no utilities/facilities on this side of town and none planned. As such, even more traffic into town if people don't have adequate walking routes to town.

At school times, the junctions/roundabouts from Chesham Road exit of the A41 are often gridlocked and these new developments would cause huge issues due to Ashlyns and Berkhamsted School drop offs/pick ups. That is why the Thakeman plan with plans to utilise the other A41 exit are more sustainable.

Please log my comment.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3198

**Person ID** 494040

**Full Name** Charles Morgan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I disagree with the new proposed Dacorum Local Plan to 2038 relating to Berkhamsted.

??

I am not against development in general but development without the necessary infrastructure is a great cause for concern.

??

The number of houses proposed for the area is excessive.

??

Berkhamsted???'s Shootersway/Kingshill is congested and somewhat dangerous at present even before phase 2 Bearoc Park, never mind a new development plan.

??

Eating into Green Belt is the thin end of the wedge.

??

I hope sense will prevail and any further development is preceded with sufficient infrastructure schemes being put in place.

??

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3200
<b>Person ID</b>	1263567
<b>Full Name</b>	Malcolm and Linda Cooper
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write in response to the public consultation in progress and relating to the proposals outlined in the brochure and on line by DBC for housing development in the Towns of Tring Berkhamsted and Northchurch.</p> <p>My initial thoughts are that the calculations are WRONG and the numbers of required dwellings have been manipulated by the government algorithms to increase from 355 to over 1000 per year from 2021 to 2038. This alarming unjustified enhancement will undoubtedly impact on Green Belt land and ANOB. The planned development sites show this to be fact and those that don't fall in this category are destined to be shrouded in pollution from the A41 traffic.</p> <p>My wife and I live in Northchurch, a parish within its own right and supporting its own Parish Council. DBC have opted to refer to us as West Berkhamsted and as such, little if any thought has been given to the huge unsustainable impact it will have to bear. There is just one road connecting Tring with Berkhamsted and that is very narrow at points, totally unsuitable to cope with the vast increase of traffic should these proposal sites be approved.</p> <p>The infrastructure improvements outlined in the proposal do not go anywhere near far enough. The station car parks at both Tring and Berkhamsted are full to capacity with commuter traffic every working day. The Doctors and Dentists are overstretched and the Hospitals seemingly unable to cope. Shop parking is sparse and where will the water come from. One good summer and bans are imposed.</p> <p>Your proposals will permanently change our delightful market towns into urban sprawls that are not sustainable and the loss of Green Belt is irresponsible. Wildlife through loss of habitat will suffer and once gone can never be replaced. This is unthinkable and absolutely not what we want for future generations.</p> <p>Let us not overlook that reportedly there are 600 000 EMPTY properties in England and innumerable brownfield sites. Concreting over fields is totally unnecessary. They must be preserved for our future.</p>

I would encourage a response.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3201

**Person ID** 399455

**Full Name** Mrs Barbara Harley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to object to the proposal of another school and 2236 homes coming to Berkhamsted. Berkhamsted is and was a historic market town with lots of history.

Where is the money coming from to fund and help with all these future developments? Recently an application was proposed at the top of Shooters way lane and the top of Tower close. This will have a massive impact on the resident's dignity and privacy. Berkhamsted residents need privacy.

Due to the housing expansion, gardens are becoming overlooked. A friend of mine who lives in Hemel, said a planning application to change a building to a nursery, now it apparently impinges on people's garden and privacy.

Due to our doctors surgery relocating recently, I have now got to walk further. There are several elderly people like myself in this neighbourhood and some have difficulty walking. How are they supposed to get to the Gp? Also if more houses are built, available appointments, will become unavailable to people in urgent need due to the over crowding of our surgeries.

We also have several schools in the local area, we do not need any more schools. If you are not careful we will be clogged up and no one will be able to move due to the volume of traffic, residents and homes.

I hope you respect my points of view.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS3217
<b>Person ID</b>	1263571
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sylvia Wren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would state that the proposed plan for future development around the berkhamsted and Tring, together with planned development in Aylesbury Vale would result in a level of urban sprawl which is totally unacceptable.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3231
<b>Person ID</b>	1144598
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Julian Dent
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Infrastructure &amp; sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport study takes <i>no</i> account of Berkhamsted's geography and <u>valley</u> Most building is proposed along the top of the valley. The residents of these houses will need to access the town and, owing to the steep hills involved, will by-and-large use their cars, exacerbating existing traffic congestion and parking problems.</li> </ul>

- There are no significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion and pollution.
- There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted's traffic situation, which is already excessive.
- Residents from the new housing needing to access the north side of the town and beyond will increase the flow over roads that are already blighted by volumes, speeding and pollution. Gravel Path and New road suffer from choke points over the canal or under the railway or both, creating knock-on congestion back into the town.
- No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes. These are essential given the steel hills between the majority of the new housing and the town
- No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)
- The 'wildlife corridors' are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don't connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.
- The nearest hospitals are already operating beyond their capacities, and there is no provision for increasing their capacity to cope with the increased numbers of residents planned
- The Plan claims that 2 primary schools and a secondary school will be built in Berkhamsted. It does not set out who will do this and how it will be funded.

### **Water**

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It's not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested. Again, any planning actions based on this flawed plan will be highly vulnerable to judicial review.

### **Employment Strategy**

- The Plan needs to be recast in the light of the major shifts in working and living habits accelerated by the Covid crisis. Working from home will significantly reduce the need for office space. In the Employment Strategy 8.10 additional office space of 188,000 square meters will need to be revised down, avoiding the need to encroach on Green belt (8.18)
- The town of Berkhamsted is already overwhelmed by traffic and under-provided with parking. Several businesses have already left the town for these reasons.

### **Greenbelt**

- Nearly all development proposed will be on Greenbelt. – this is *against* Government policy.

- The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. A green buffer is needed. If this land is built upon, the already poor air quality on the south side of the town (and in the valley) will be considerably degraded beyond legal limits. There is no up-to-date consideration for this issue in the Plan
- DBC should look at further Brownfield sites – as it is required to do.

### Pollution

- Last but not least...Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Traffic already regularly breaks the 20 mph speed limit in Berkhamsted with impunity, creating pedestrian danger and damaging air quality for the many schools that lie on, or close to, the A4251 that runs through Berkhamsted and Northchurch
- Berkhamsted lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area. The proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.
- DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.

### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3271
<b>Person ID</b>	1253872
<b>Full Name</b>	Georgia Huelamo
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Northchurch is not West Berkhamsted. It is a Parish in its own right and should be recognised as this when putting any plans forward.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3341
<b>Person ID</b>	1261609
<b>Full Name</b>	DEBORAH CROOKS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The government algorithm for calculating the number of new homes required is flawed as stated in Inside housing "Councils have complained that the government's new planning formula "seems to have been made without any assessment of demographic, market needs, delivery or capacity issues".</p> <p>2. The strategy should be focusing on protecting the Green Belt to absorb carbon emissions and keeping our natural heritage.</p> <p>The developments intended for Berkhamsted along the A41 these areas were designed as nature corridors when the A41 was built. The building on these sites will have a negative impact for the wildlife in this area.</p> <p>3. The increase of population will obviously have an impact on the increase of traffic and pollution that is linked to this.</p> <p>4. The quality of life will be affected by the increase in density of housing and traffic.</p> <p>Affordability is ill defined in the plan. If it is proposed that the current government guidance of 80% of market value is used, the majority of local people working in the borough are ruled out of being able to purchase a house.</p> <p>Genuinely affordable should mean the rent or level of mortgage repayment is no more than a third of the household income, this must be calculated on the income of workers in Dacorum, not London, where average salaries are higher.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3352
<b>Person ID</b>	1012318
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Hennell

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Area Planner Canal and River Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Any new residential or employment uses adjacent to the canal or likely to result in an increase in its use should recognise the benefits the canal towpath can bring and actively look at ways these benefits can be increased and improved upon. This could include improvements to the towpath to allow it to be used more as a sustainable transport route but also include waterbased recreation and access facilities such as car parking. Developers should contribute to the costs of improving and maintaining these facilities through S106 and CIL payments. More detail will provided relating to individual sites.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3368
<b>Person ID</b>	1263693
<b>Full Name</b>	Ruth Colderwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Most of the housing is situated on the side of town nearest the A 41, this will make the area very densely populated. We are losing a lot of green space where people currently can walk. There has already been significant housing put on this side of town near to Egerton School, which has increased traffic significantly so trying to get in/out of town has been much more difficult.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3440
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Plan states:  “23.110 These Growth Areas will come forward in a comprehensive, cohesive and co-ordinated manner. Their scale offers benefits for infrastructure co-ordination and delivery, enabling a fuller range of site and town-wide infrastructure needs to be considered and planned for, especially the need for two 2FE primary schools, a 6FE secondary school and significant levels of formal and informal open space.”</p> <p><i>Comment: This acknowledged scale of population increase especially through the need for many new schools will also put tremendous strain on already massively stretched sporting and leisure facilities – so similar growth of sporting infrastructure must also be provided for. However, sports infrastructure provision seems to have been omitted from consideration for Berkhamsted within the plan. This is exacerbated by the fact that the benefits of the rejected Bulbourne Cross site (promoted by Thakeham Homes in association with Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charitable Association), which includes a proposal for a major new sporting hub and is a much more beneficial site to meet overall housing, sporting and recreational needs in Berkhamsted than the proposed sites.</i></p> <p>The Plan states:  23.112 The key objectives for the new neighbourhood...</p> <p><i>Comment: The objectives listed in the Plan do not include the need to meet the existing shortfall of sporting facilities (especially playing pitches) and/or address the new/increased demand for such facilities that will result from the proposed housing numbers. This plan and strategy is a final opportunity to address the problem of shortages in playing pitch space in the town as well as indoor and ancillary sporting facilities which will become a critical issue if not addressed in this plan.</i></p> <p>The Plan states:  23.131 Policy SP21 - Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted</p>

Item 7 of Masterplan Delivery for Berkhamsted - "...deliver the infrastructure requirements set out in the Dacorum Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Berkhamsted."

*Comment: If, as it should, the Infrastructure Plan for Berkhamsted is expected to meet the significant need for large scale increase in playing field space and other sporting facility development, then this will be made almost impossible given the mix of sites currently proposed within the Emerging Strategy for Growth. The constricted nature of the Town and the exclusion of the Thakeham Homes Bulbourne Cross site means that this plan will fail to deliver item 7 and make it a failure that it will be impossible to put right at any time in the future. This is a last chance opportunity to deliver item 7 and it will fail if not addressed in this plan*

Ref: 23.131 Policy SP21 - Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted

*Comment: Ditto our response to South Berkhamsted above*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3467

**Person ID** 1159198

**Full Name** Edward Hatley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3653

**Person ID** 1263900

<b>Full Name</b>	JOE TAYLOR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to register my disagreement with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed within Berkhamsted. They are well above the forecast housing need for the Borough a do not seem to consider the recent major developments in the area (notably Bearroc Park). The infrastructure in the Shootersway area will be significantly affected.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3658
<b>Person ID</b>	1263906
<b>Full Name</b>	JANE VAUGHAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to say that I totally disagree with with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3666
<b>Person ID</b>	1263909



<b>Full Name</b>	IAN TUPMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am contacting you regarding the proposed housing developments. As a resident of Berkhamsted for 30 years I have seen the town expand and feel very strongly that increasing the number of houses proposed in the “Emerging Strategy For Growth “ will be detrimental to the town, putting a strain on the local amenities as well as changing the nature of the market town which is currently surrounded by areas of natural beauty, farmland and woodland. It is the very nature of the size, location, amenities and surrounding countryside that make Berkhamsted such a popular place to live.</p> <p><b>I would like to register a very strong objection to the choice of several of the development sites contained within the plan regarding Berkhamsted area.</b></p> <p>My objections are based on the following:</p> <p><b>* Incorrect assumptions for housing provision.</b> The proposed number of houses should be significantly lower than the target to reflect the actual demonstrable need for housing, indeed for more generally affordable housing.</p> <p>The council do not appear to have taken account of the National Planning Policy Framework which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development eg its impact on Green Belt and AONB. The algorithm method used for calculating housing need does not correctly calculate the housing needs of the borough. It has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will significantly over estimate housing needs. In December 2020 the Government stated “ the numbers produced by the standard method poses a risk to protected landscapes and greenbelt... and meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places"</p> <p>A higher proportion of housing should be built on brown sites in the existing urban areas away from Green belt and Chiltern AONB sites.</p> <p><b>* Impact on greenbelt and other designated land.</b></p> <p>85% Dacorum is rural, 60% is green belt and 33% of countryside is in Chiltern AONB. I remind the Council on the stance of our local MP Gagan Mohindra in an email sent to my neighbour in November 2020 “ I stood on a platform of protecting the green belt and will continue to fight that battle on a national level. I have previously written to Minister Rt Hon Chris Pincher at MHCLG about my concerns. At a local level we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents. The only way to do this is through Dacorum Borough Council finalising its local plan as soon as possible. “</p>

The area proposed for housing behind Upper Hall Park is Greenbelt and in addition is on the ridge line of the valley extending down to area of natural beauty with woodland supporting various birds and other wildlife. At no other place within the town does building extend up to the ridge line, and the loss of the woodland will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife .

**\* Failure to provide adequate Supportive Infrastructure.**

In reference to the building in Berkhamsted and the green belt areas edging the town, there is absolutely insufficient consideration in the plan for the provision of new or upgrading the current infrastructure in the town to support the increased growth in population the number of houses proposed would create. It is already a town at capacity in terms of schooling at primary and especially at secondary school which has recently had to increase its entry numbers to meet need of current residents. Also the local roads are busy and full of cars, parking difficult, doctors surgeries very busy with large practice population; indicating the town is already at capacity in so many ways.

I trust my objection and rationale will be taken into account.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3667
<b>Person ID</b>	1257698
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Block
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Haslam Fields should be retained as a sports facility, not filled with housing.</p> <p>No further development should be permitted to the South of Berkhamsted. The area is not appropriate for housing. Being so close to the bypass, noise cannot be filtered out, toxins in the air are dangerous, and from the bypass such development would be an eyesore - certainly not suited to an area of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>The Ashlyns School site is probably adequate for the NOS predictions of numbers over many years of modest expansion in population,so a second secondary school is not required.</p> <p>The Civic Centre is an important facility and focal point for the community</p>

Lock Field, Northchurch, should be retained as green space by the canal.

Jewson site should remain as an employment provider, preferably for a number of small companies, and not be used for storage and distribution, nor for housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3669

**Person ID** 222678

**Full Name** Mrs Tupman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am contacting you regarding the proposed housing developments. As a resident of Berkhamsted for 30 years I have seen the town expand and feel very strongly that increasing the number of houses proposed in the “Emerging Strategy For Growth “ will be detrimental to the town, putting a strain on the local amenities as well as changing the nature of the market town which is currently surrounded by areas of natural beauty, farmland and woodland. It is the very nature of the size, location, amenities and surrounding countryside that make Berkhamsted such a popular place to live.

**I would like to register a very strong objection to the choice of several of the development sites contained within the plan regarding Berkhamsted area.**

My objections are based on the following:

\* **Incorrect assumptions for housing provision.** The proposed number of houses should be significantly lower than the target to reflect the actual demonstrable need for housing, indeed for more generally affordable housing.

The council do not appear to have taken account of the National Planning Policy Framework which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development eg its impact on Green Belt and AONB. The algorithm method used for calculating housing need does not correctly calculate the housing needs of the borough. It has wrongly based its calculations on

the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will significantly over estimate housing needs. In December 2020 the Government stated “ the numbers produced by the standard method poses a risk to protected landscapes and greenbelt... and meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places”

A higher proportion of housing should be built on brown sites in the existing urban areas away from Green belt and Chiltern AONB sites.

**\* Impact on greenbelt and other designated land.**

85% Dacorum is rural, 60% is green belt and 33% of countryside is in Chiltern AONB. I remind the Council on the stance of our local MP Gagan Mohindra in an email sent to my neighbour in November 2020 “ I stood on a platform of protecting the green belt and will continue to fight that battle on a national level. I have previously written to Minister Rt Hon Chris Pincher at MHCLG about my concerns. At a local level we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents. The only way to do this is through Dacorum Borough Council finalising its local plan as soon as possible. “

The area proposed for housing behind Upper Hall Park is Greenbelt and in addition is on the ridge line of the valley extending down to area of natural beauty with woodland supporting various birds and other wildlife. At no other place within the town does building extend up to the ridge line, and the loss of the woodland will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife .

**\* Failure to provide adequate Supportive Infrastructure.**

In reference to the building in Berkhamsted and the green belt areas edging the town, there is absolutely insufficient consideration in the plan for the provision of new or upgrading the current infrastructure in the town to support the increased growth in population the number of houses proposed would create. It is already a town at capacity in terms of schooling at primary and especially at secondary school which has recently had to increase its entry numbers to meet need of current residents. Also the local roads are busy and full of cars, parking difficult, doctors surgeries very busy with large practice population; indicating the town is already at capacity in so many ways.

I trust my objection and rationale will be taken into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3671

**Person ID** 1263914

**Full Name** DARREN PORTER-HOUGH

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I want to object to the proposed new homes in our local area (Dacorum) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property numbers really concerns me the most. The 16,899 homes is a disproportionate increase considering the Governments projected population growth statistics. This is an unreasonable and unnecessary burden to undertake for our locality.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposed housing in our neighbouring towns of Tring and Berkhamsted, in addition to the 400 houses in Northchurch, will cause traffic congestion especially on our High Street. That's not discounting the obvious increased pollution and hazard this poses our children especially with our school placed right bang centre of the village with poor side-walks and access.</li> <li>• Northchurch is a village and is therefore very connected to its beautiful local countryside. Building on Green belt here and in Dacorum is unlawful as it has not been proven to be necessary. Within minutes of my home I can walk into lovely countryside and enjoy the peace and fresh air it provides, as well as the nature that inhabits it. You can not undervalue its importance for our physical and mental well being which to be honest has been highlighted in this Pandemic</li> <li>• I really worries me that we would lose our community and village identity as we meld into Berkhamsted. We are proud and see ourselves apart from Berkhamsted and wish to keep it this way. I've read mention of our village as 'West Berkhamsted' and this upsets me as we have lovely tree lined roads a plenty, drives for our cars to park on and our own real sense of identity quite different to Berkhamsted.</li> </ul> <p>Please see the bigger picture and realise how unreasonable your current proposal is</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3675
<b>Person ID</b>	1263916
<b>Full Name</b>	MARK TYLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have lived in beautiful Berkhamsted for over 10 years. I have taken great interest in the development of the town and particularly how it has grown to meet the housing needs within the borough. I wish for my views to be recorded regarding the proposals contained within the "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)".</p> <p>I register a very strong objection to the choice of several of the development sites that are contained within the Plan. Noting I live in Berkhamsted, the prime objection is to the proposed developments within the Berkhamsted area. My objection is based upon three fundamental strategic grounds outlined below:</p> <p><u>Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision.</u> Accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular genuinely affordable housing, I have concerns regarding the enormous scale of proposed development of Dacorum. The Council appears not to have considered the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them. The Council will be aware that on Wednesday 16 December the government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government also said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." and they went on to say "Within the current planning system the standard method does <u>not</u> present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."</li> </ul> <p><u>Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land.</u> The Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". It is evident that in meeting the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the over-inflated housing need, the Council proposes that, as a necessity,</p>

development must, therefore, take place on Green Belt land or land that is specially designated for other purposes. 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; these are for many people the prime reasons that they have chosen to live in this area. I remind the Council of the stance of our local Member of Parliament, Gagan Mohindra, on Green Belt land, which was included in an email response to me dated 17 November 2020. This appears to set out the Council's duty to plan for housing provision and protect our Green Belt and specially designated land:

- "I stood on a platform of protecting the Green Belt and will continue to fight that battle on a national level. I have previously written to Minister Rt Hon Chris Pincher at MHCLG about my concerns. At a local level, we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents. The only way to do this is through Dacorum Borough Council finalising its Local Plan as soon as possible".

Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure. Specifically, I look at the proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted and state categorically that there is insufficient consideration in the Plan for the provision of new or of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments. Berkhamsted is already a Town which is at capacity in terms of schooling, road services, water supply and wastewater disposal.

I request that my objection is fully taken into account. You will undoubtedly see many more similar objections from other residents of Berkhamsted that the proposed developments within the town are wrongly premised, should not take place on Green Belt land and do not make proper provision for improved infrastructure for the town to accommodate such large developments.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3679

**Person ID** 1151416

**Full Name** MR MARK ADAMS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I write to comment on the proposed Dacorum local plan as it relates to Berkhamsted.

I do not object in principle to expansion, but I do object to the way this plan continues the recent trend of development, which ignores Berkhamsted's geographical constraints and results in an overcrowded town centre and over-reliance on cars.

Most of the new housing proposed is above and to the south of the valley on which the town is centred, whilst almost all amenities are at the valley bottom. The substantial hill between the two is an obstacle for many people to walking and cycling, which will increase car journeys and parking requirements. This effect on modes and patterns of travel in Berkhamsted is not reflected in the plan, and contravenes its Sustainable Transport Strategy (see especially policy DM53 on walking and cycling).

Furthermore, the crowded valley bottom lacks the space for more infrastructure for a growing town. For example, there is already a lack of green space, and only one, overburdened, full-size supermarket. The plan itself notes (at 23.119) that Berkhamsted suffers from "constrained roads, difficulties with bus movements, and limited cycling infrastructure".

In view of these travel patterns and lack of space in the centre, new developments above the valley to the south need their own amenities. But although the plan includes schools and green space, there is no proposal for any true community hubs of the kind scattered around Hemel Hempstead. Instead, there is mention of just one retail unit at "Berkhamsted South" (23.109), and no new employment.

Far from making the necessary proposals, the plan states (in policy DM64) that "New community facilities will be supported in principle *where they do not conflict with other policies within this Plan*" (my italics). This does not sit well with paragraph 22.57 which immediately precedes it:

Facilities in new development can help create community cohesion, provide essential services for residents, and are a crucial part of effective place-making. However, it is essential that they are brought forward in a timely fashion to meet the needs of the new occupiers as they arise. We will expect larger Growth Areas to directly provide a range of community facilities to serve existing and new communities and for these to be located within new local centre hubs.

This is precisely what has been lacking in Berkhamsted's "above the valley" development.

I suggest that the proposed housing should be centred on two community hubs, one serving the collection of new sites on the south-west edge of the town, and the other at the "Berkhamsted South" site. The first of these is long overdue: the many developments off Shootersway require residents to reach everything but schooling by car.

Not only is adequate infrastructure missing from the plan, but its proposals for delivery of what there is (policy SP7) amount merely to warm words. Crucially (at para. 2), the policy suggests that developers make financial contributions for infrastructure and collaborate between sites. Past experience has shown that this results in a footbridge here and a pavement there, but offers no hope of the community hubs required. The Borough Council should take ownership, allocating parcels of land in the development areas and building the infrastructure independently of, but funded by, the housing.

Whilst this approach will reduce the new housing totals, it is widely acknowledged that the current government formula, on which the plan is based, has allocated too many homes to South East England.



As it stands, this local plan has much detail about where and how many houses to build, but says little on the quality-of-life issue which I have outlined. As such, it looks like an exercise in meeting housing quotas. At 23.101 the plan states: “Given its size, level of facilities and transport links, [Berkhamsted] should be an important focus for meeting the Borough’s development needs.” If this development is all to be based on the existing topography-constrained town centre, then the citizens of Berkhamsted can look forward to a future in which even more of their life is spent queuing in cars.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3690

**Person ID** 1263930

**Full Name** Lucy, Jonathan and Ruby Curtis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to oppose all development plans for Berkhamsted and NorthChurch areas.  
 We are experiencing a climate emergency.  
 Destroying our green areas in further contributing to this. Instead our council should be focused on creating more green areas and planting trees to help Dacorum in the contribution to Net Zero Carbon lifestyle.  
 I cant understand how our high street and surrounding schools would cope with the traffic, volume of people and impact on the environment by having not one bit TWO new developments either end of Berkhamsted High Street.  
 There is NO NEED for more housing. There is a need for more green areas and caring for wildlife and greenbelt areas more than ever at this time of a climate emergency!  
 Please take this as my absolute opposition to these planning permissions and I speak for all residents of St Margaret's Close in Berkhamsted. 30 households of families who want to save our green belt areas and make a stand against these developments.  
 Like everyone else in Northchurch and Berkhamsted we love our rural setting and our village and want to keep it the way it is

— The over all number of houses proposed - 16,899 across the borough — is just not justified by the latest statistics on projected population growth

— massive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will cause gridlock in Northchurch High St as well as the 400 houses earmarked for Northchurch itself

— The grounds for encroaching on the Green Belt have not been made out - the law says we can only build on the Green Belt if it has proven to be necessary - this is simply not the case!

— Insufficient value has been put on the Green Belt both in terms our mental and physical wellbeing and the impact on climate change

We are asking the council to consider the future generations who will suffer because of the constant destruction of green areas. Climate crisis is real, we hope that Dacorum will act responsibly when making future decisions and help our borough become a net zero community.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3713

**Person ID** 1263937

**Full Name** Marion MacGillivray

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have lived at Northchurch, Berkhamsted, Herts. for more than 8 years. One of the attractions of living here is the wonderful view I have over Northchurch Common. I am very concerned that the Plan will have a damaging effect on that view and on the Green Belt generally in this area. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB. It also jeopardises plans, currently under early stages of discussion, to potentially extend the AONB or upgrade its status to that of a National Park. Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, I have serious concerns regarding the sheer scale of proposed development. In my view, the Council has failed to take account of National

Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB.

I believe that Local Plans are best developed using an integrated approach that puts climate change, biodiversity, well-being and social inclusion at the centre of the plan. Dacorum Borough Council declared a climate emergency more than a year ago. Despite this and some well-intentioned promises, the Strategy as published clearly prioritises economic growth and greenfield land development over considerations for the climate emergency. In so doing, it has failed to take account of legislation and recommendations from various UK bodies on how carbon reduction plans have to be integral to the development of local plans.

Words of 'encouragement' are insufficient and no substitute for detailed carbon budgets and committed targets of local carbon reductions. This is a requirement of the NPPF and the 2004 Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act. A carbon reduction plan or pathway is required to meet the current national climate obligations of net zero by 2050 and this work should underpin a revised land use and development strategy. The proposed level of development in Dacorum, along with potential development in neighbouring St Albans City and District, Three Rivers District and in Buckinghamshire east of Aylesbury, would place an unacceptable burden on all types of infrastructure services and facilities in Dacorum. The plan as proposed does little to address the improvements in infrastructure required to support the proposed increase in housing. We have particular concerns regarding the impact on water supply and waste water disposal. The level of new housing proposed is expected to put severe strains on water supplies to Dacorum during the 2020s under drought conditions. In these circumstances there would be no option but to extract additional water from the chalk aquifer which in turn would cause further damage to the Borough's precious chalk streams. New supplies of water are not likely to be possible until after 2030. The growth proposed by the Strategy would require substantial infrastructure improvements in order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage. This might take at least ten years to complete, and be extremely expensive as well as disruptive to affected communities.

The Emerging Strategy for Growth appears to be based on documents that have no formal planning status and which have not been widely consulted on. As a result, the Strategy has failed to take account of a number of important issues - the climate emergency, the environmental impact of the proposed development, and the prioritisation of 'brownfield' sites to meet housing needs. The pursuit of economic growth as promoted by the Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership and implied by background work for a South West Herts Joint Strategic Plan, should be balanced against environmental concerns and climate obligations before they are tested through the local plan process.

I am also concerned that the possibility of a link road through our delightful close is again being considered. This would completely destroy its charms and make it a rat run.

I do hope you take my concerns into account and change the proposed Plan accordingly.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3740

**Person ID** 1263908

<b>Full Name</b>	Thomas Burger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted is busy enough without adding 2200 new homes. This is an outdated survey and does not take into the effects of Brexit and Covid. Destroying the precious green that makes this area so attractive would not only be an environmental disaster but a logistical one too, there is no way the trains could cope, they are busy enough during the rush hour without adding a minimum of 2200 new people using it. The high street is also very busy and although its suggested another Highstreet will be created it will almost certainly create an influx of people to Berkhamsted. Finally the A41 is very busy during peak times, how do you expect it to cope with 2200 new people driving up and down it?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3742
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS3756
<b>Person ID</b>	1263939
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Dawkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This response related to the Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy. The conclusion that “given its size, level of facilities, and transport links, the settlement should be an important focus for meeting the borough’s development needs” (Footnote 14: Paragraph 23.201 p222: Draft Local Plan) does not take into account the topographical constraints of the town, whereby a significant proportion of all traffic crossing the town needs to pass along the high street, London road, causing congestion and air pollution issues. Access to the railway station is also challenging given the single lane road under the railway bridge providing access from Lower Kings Road to the station car park on Brownlow Road. A fuller explanation of the infrastructure challenges facing Berkhamsted is set out in the response to question 5.</p> <p>Indeed, following the conclusion of paragraph 23.201, the Draft Local Plan further states “growth will need to be carefully managed in order to take into account of existing local highway [...] deficiencies in the town”. Neither the Draft Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan of November 2020 or paragraphs 23.119 to 23.121 of the Draft Local Plan provide a solution to these deficiencies and the inherent topography of the town cannot be changed.</p> <p>Paragraph 23.201 of the Draft Local Plan should therefore be updated to say “While its size, level of facilities and transport links may prime facie indicate Berkhamsted could be an important focus for meeting the borough’s development needs, there are inherent constraints in the town’s topography meaning growth potential is constrained.”</p> <p>On a separate point, paragraphs 23.104 to 23.106 should be updated once a new Draft Plan has been created to match the updated housing need (see response to question 2)</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Evidence Photos Richard Dawkins.png</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3790
<b>Person ID</b>	1263946

<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Scott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>1. Quantity of housing proposed for Shootersway area of Berkhamsted</u> I disagree with the quantity of housing proposed. As an example, sites adjacent and near Shootersway. I don't believe it is safe to build this quantity of housing given the current transport arrangements. The traffic already queues half way along Shootersway on a normal working morning. Further, the pavement leading to the small roundabout connecting Shootersway and Cross Oak Road is too thin already for children to walk safely to Greenway School and Ashlyns School. In fact my own mother was injured by close traffic whilst walking my son to school a few years ago. The traffic situation has deteriorated since then. I know that your plan states that you're not responsible for this infrastructure but I must object to this vast increase in housing as that stretch of road is already busy and unsafe.</p> <p>Housing should be built in safe quantities, on sites that are safe to use for all and particularly children.</p> <p><u>2. Schools, medical and leisure</u> Doctors' surgery capacity has not been included other than that afforded by the new combined surgery at Gossom's End. Ditto schooling. Where's the guarantee that schools can cope and thrive?</p> <p><u>3. Green Belt and green loss</u> Covid lockdowns and restrictions have highlighted desperate need for green space. On Shootersway, during lockdowns the 'walking loop' of Shootersway and Shootersway Lane was packed (and it's supposed to be a private road). Where else will people walk/ run if Green Belt is built on? Given the quantity of housing already built at Baerroc Park I don't feel there's justification for building on this Green Belt land. Hockeridge Woods are heavily used at current levels of housing. What plans are in place to sustain these valuable woods if housing is increased?</p> <p><u>4. Transport.</u> Car use will vastly increase with this quantity of housing. Very few people walk and cycle to town as it is. This is exacerbated by the narrow pavements on Shootersway and Kings Road. It's certainly unsafe to walk with young children as the pavement is one person wide.</p> <p><u>5. Leisure for children</u> Sports Centre needs an upgrade in any case. Raiders (providing essential sport for hundreds of children) already struggle to find pitches to train and play on. Playground options are unambitious presently.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3794
<b>Person ID</b>	497160
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs B_R Agar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>With regard to the number of new homes envisaged for Berkhamsted and Dacorum, I feel strongly that the infrastructure will not be appropriate.</p> <p>I understand that Watford Hospital is only going to be refurbished WITH NO MORE BEDS. How can they accommodate the possible 40,000 to 60,000 more people from the 16,600 new homes, just in Dacorum - you can't get a quart into a pint pot! It has been very difficult to get doctor's appointments in Berkhamsted, even before the virus.</p> <p>Parking and traffic in Berkhamsted will become even more of a problem with all the new houses, as they will want to access the supermarkets, doctors, schools etc. and Berkhamsted has very narrow roads. Trains have always been crowded, as well as the car park at the station, so that will also present problems. As well as the lack of sufficient infrastructure, we will also ruin the nature of historic old towns like Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The Government should be levelling up and encouraging businesses to move North, which I believe they have already started with some Government Departments. During the virus, more people have found that they can live further away from where they work.</p> <p>Please rethink your plan and don't ruin lovely old towns like Berkhamsted and put people in danger and inconvenience from lack of sufficient infrastructure.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3804
<b>Person ID</b>	1263957

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Megan Gronow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing in response to the Dacorum Borough council's proposed local plan for "Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038."</p> <p>I am 25 years of age and have lived in Berkhamsted since birth. I have a number of concerns regarding the proposed plan and these include, the number of houses in the plan and how this number has been derived and the amount of Greenbelt and greenspace land that will be given up for these homes.</p> <p>Firstly, a proposed 24% increase in housing proposed in Berkhamsted is an incredibly large number for a town ill-prepared to handle that level of increase in population. Not only does the plan not include any significant proposals for improvements to roads of traffic flow as a result of the local plan developments, but this level of added housing will undoubtedly increase the amount of traffic in town, and therefore the levels of pollution and congestion. The town is already a bit of a nightmare to navigate through during peak times as traffic has increased during recent years. I am also concerned that the plan also doesn't state there will be any additional health services.</p> <p>I am also shocked to read that nearly all the development proposed in the plan will be on Greenbelt land - which is against Government policy. Can the council not look further into Brownfield sites - as they are required to do so.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3808
<b>Person ID</b>	1263958
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm a resident of Berkhamsted as such I'm <b>against</b> much of the draft Local Plan for Berkhamsted, specifically against Draft Local Plan Section 23.1. The reasons for this are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Quite a number of sites appear to be on green belt land. I don't believe we should be eroding this very important protection of our countryside.</li> <li>2 A high number of people move to and live in Berkhamsted to use the train, mainly to London. Nearly all these sites are a long way from the station and on the other side of the High Street to the station. There appears to be no proposed transport solutions for this, for instance, an improved low cost/free bus services to coordinate with trains (ie. an integrated transport solution). As a result this will considerably increase traffic in the town centre.</li> <li>3 Its not clear how the two plots on either side of Swingate Lane (SL) will connect to the A41. If the new residents have to go through the town centre this will also drive up traffic congestion. If the plan is to connect to A41 via the plots west of SL, traffic from the plot east of SL and from that end of Berkhamsted will pass through the plots west of SL creating a 'Rat Run' through the new residential area increasing the road traffic danger to children and air and noise pollution levels for all.</li> <li>4 As with point 2 above many of these site are a long way for other facilities, for instance large food shops, doctors, dentists, pharmacists, churches, restaurants, bars, public buildings etc. So to access these facilities virtually all trips will be by car.</li> <li>5 For affordable housing (which is proposed to be 40%) car ownership is lower and with no or poor public transport this could leave a significant minority isolated. For many of these sites eg. all the sites along the side of the A41 there are no bus services, the hills are too steep to cycle and too far for most to walk.</li> <li>6 Many of the sites are directly alongside the busy A41, in the prevailing wind direction of the road with virtually no protection from trees or embankments. As such houses there will suffer considerable noise and air pollution.</li> <li>7 I'm against the Shootersway Playing Fields being built on. The pandemic has highlighted the valuable role that exercise plays in healthy living and we should preserve every space we can for children and adults to exercise on. This plot should be removed from the plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3820
<b>Person ID</b>	1263966
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Northwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I disagree with the plan to build 2236 houses in Berkhamsted. We're already creaking under the additional recent housing that has been added which came with no increase in services or thoughts to traffic management. You're going to at least double that again on a key road which is gridlocked twice a day.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3848
<b>Person ID</b>	1263987
<b>Full Name</b>	Matt Cain
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Rugby Club
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a Chairman of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents, which is an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>We are keen to expand the people who can play and a dedicated Rugby pitch will help the growth of the sport in Berkhamsted enormously. We have a lot of interest in joining but often we have too many players and too few times to play. We'd like to be in a place where there is a real supportive community sport feel – and these proposals really deliver that and I don't feel any other development proposed for Berkhamsted can. It is a game changer.</p> <p>Please log my comment on behalf of the Berkhamsted Rugby Club.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3863
<b>Person ID</b>	1207786
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>23.101 The Settlement Hierarchy study identifies this area as one of the most sustainable towns in the Borough as it provides a hub for a range of services and facilities for its residents and surrounding rural hinterland. Given its size, level of facilities and transport links, the settlement should be an important focus for meeting the Borough's development needs.</i></p> <p>As Previously mentioned the SHS is flawed as it takes no account of the constraints of the town. Much of the proposals are again just words with no vestige of reality behind them.</p> <p><i>23.102 Growth will need to be carefully managed in order to take account of existing local highway, primary and secondary schooling, service constraints, and open space deficiencies in the town. As a consequence, growth will be transport / accessibility and infrastructure led and be chiefly brought forward as larger releases to help deliver these.</i></p> <p>There are no proposals to address the existing highway constraints in the town, nor to provide mitigation measures for additional traffic generated from sites at the top of the valley sites where the car is the only feasible means of accessing the towns facilities for most.</p> <p>How will growth be managed given that no phasing is proposed and given that the imposed Housing numbers are over twice the current ONS projection, how will you ensure that Greenbelt is not sacrificed for development that may not materialise.</p> <p><i>3.114 The Employment Land Study recommends that the existing employment areas are safeguarded for this purpose given that these sites are well occupied and they represent Berkhamsted's main employment locations.</i></p> <p>Employment opportunities are not being safeguarded, nor are business activities The proposals mean loss of employment areas with the proposed development of the Sarthe Business Park, BFI and the Civic Centre, and possibly the loss of local businesses and services provided on the by the Sarthe and Civic Centre sites.</p>

*The emphasis will be on protecting the diverse range of business activities they support and potential opportunities for other related uses there, in order to maintain a reasonable balance between new homes and jobs.*

Where are the proposals to support this assertion? 2200 + homes are proposed with a reduction in employment opportunities, and key businesses that serve the local community will potentially be lost with the development of the Sarthe business park

*23.116 The key district shopping and service role of the town centre will be maintained and diversified, and planned and natural growth in the town should help boost overall levels of spend there.*

Diversified ? How? What does the plan envisage – no detail is provided.

*In reality, the town centre benefits from residents with generally high levels of disposable income, low property vacancy rates, an attractive historic environment, and a thriving evening economy.*

The town centre cannot expand, the shops are in general small and busy. Development on the scale proposed may destroy the character of the town. I have seen no assessment of the impact on the town centre of such large scale development just an assumption that it will add to its vibrancy.

*We will take opportunities to improve public transport provision and the general connectivity of the town centre.*

There are no proposals in the Transport Study to support this assertion, indeed the transport study says that buses are unlikely to be used because of cost. There are no intra town buses and currently no buses in the evening. How will these “ opportunities” be identified?

*The completion of the multi-storey car park on Lower Kings Road will add to the supply of spaces and ease parking pressures for shoppers, visitors and workers. Furthermore, the town centre library has been recently relocated and upgraded.*

Weasel words - The library has in fact been reduced in size including a reduction in the size the widely used children’s area and relocated so that the original library site could be developed.

The Multi Story Carpark provides relatively few additional spaces for shoppers, with much of the space given over to season ticket holders and long stay parking which will largely be used by commuters once normal service is resumed.

*23.120 There are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town. The careful location of new development and promoting opportunities for sustainable travel, will in part help tackle a number of parking and traffic issues. The completion of the multi-storey car park on Lower Kings Road (327 spaces) will also increase the availability of parking spaces in the town centre.*

Another risible statement!

Careful location of development ? ...on Greenbelt in completely non sustainable locations ( as previously discussed)

Opportunities for sustainable travel? - nothing in the Transport study ( as previously discussed)

Additional Car parking - see above - I believe there around 20 additional short term spaces over what we had before the MSCP was built - although lots of extra long term spaces for commuters.

23.121 Given their 'edge of town' locations, the strategic Growth Areas will need to focus on ensuring they are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station, and public and sustainable transport options are enhanced. All Growth Areas will be required to provide for on and off-site measures to alleviate local highway problems.

Another aspirational unfulfillable statement - where are the proposals that address the " well connected and accessible to the town centre and railway station" - there are none ! The transport study fails to address this issue - as previously discussed.

23.122 We have prepared the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy which identifies the existing issues in the town and what interventions are required to accommodate growth. This has been published separately but the main proposals will be integrated within relevant site requirements for the Growth Areas included within the Local Plan.

As discussed throughout this response, the STS fails to address any of Berkhamsted's existing congestion issues, let alone additional problems caused by the developments. Crossing points and footpaths are welcomed, although the proposals are unfeasible in some areas, but do nothing to mitigate the traffic problems, and as accepted, will not make walking or cycling to the town's facilities any more practicable given the topography of the town, and the location of developments.

23.123 Network Rail has highlighted that growth in the town will require improvements to the station capacity, including, for example, new cycle parking and the upgrading of buildings. They will be seeking contributions from new development in order to ensure these upgrades are delivered.

I don't believe this was mentioned in the IDP.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3870
<b>Person ID</b>	1263989
<b>Full Name</b>	Lauren Ashton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3882
<b>Person ID</b>	1263982
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa York
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Do not build anymore housing
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3896
<b>Person ID</b>	1263998
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lara Dixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Development of the sites around Berkhamsted specifically, will cause huge traffic congestion. Being on the fringes of the town, residents who move into these housing developments will undoubtedly use their cars to access the facilities in the town centre, the station or take their children to school. The distances proposed will mean children will have to go to school by car as its too far to walk to the primary and secondary schools. There is

limited public transport around the town. Buses that travel at appropriate times for school arrival and departure are limited and travel down the centre of town along the high street, not reaching the roads on the fringes of town. There are no safe designated cycle routes and the surrounding roads are steep to cycle up.

Without a complete overhaul of public transport and cycle routes, there is no doubt that new residents will use their cars, often for very short journeys. This will cause increased environmental and noise pollution. The town has increasing problems with congestion as the small roads were not designed for so many cars and so much on street parking.

The proposed development of 60 houses at Lock Field in Berkhamsted would involve increased traffic flow across a single track canal bridge. New Road and this bridge were not designed or engineered for a lot of traffic and are already struggling to cope at weekends when there is more traffic heading up to the Ashridge estate.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3897

**Person ID** 1264003

**Full Name** Avis Rettie

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** We do not have the infrastructure to support anymore houses. No extra doctors, schools, or hospital. The football ground should stay in its present position which is central to the town. I am opposed to developers planning on green belt once you give way to one then I can see further developments on green belt. We must not allow this as this will mean the end of our beautiful Chiltern countryside.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3906

**Person ID** 1264008

**Full Name** Antonia Gore

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In response to plans to build on the green belt of Berkhamsted I wish to voice my objections. Given the climate emergency this should not be under consideration.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3912
<b>Person ID</b>	398902
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Nigel Bamforth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I disagree with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed, for Berkhamsted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The housing numbers in the Local Plan across Dacorum, and therefore Berkhamsted are excessive and wrong. They are well above the forecast housing need for the Borough as calculated by the ONS!</li> <li>2 The impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate, does not consider existing and major development in the area (Bearroc) and severely impacts infrastructure (roads, schools etc.), pollution, congestion, road safety, local ecology, health and wellbeing of local residents.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS3916
<b>Person ID</b>	1264018
<b>Full Name</b>	Roger Greenfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to say that I disagree with the local plan to build 2236 houses in Berkhamsted. The infrastructure of Berkhamsted is already struggling with bad traffic congestion, particularly in the High Street, over-subscribed schools and the potential loss of green belt land.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3949
<b>Person ID</b>	1264025
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Sherwen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The windfall calculations and projections are flawed and have lead to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3974
<b>Person ID</b>	1263016
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanna Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>23.119</b> The town is served by a “key inter-urban Aylesbury – Hemel – Watford bus route”. Whilst the presence of said bus route – route 500 operated as a commercial service by Arriva - is correct, it operates at a frequency of 3 buses per hour on Monday- Friday, 2 buses per hour on Saturdays and 1 bus per hour on Sunday shopping hours. There is no evening service or early service on Saturdays. Due to its length, it also suffers from reliability issues. Despite fulfilling the criteria of a “good public transport service” in the Topic papers, there is the paucity of services in other directions from Berkhamsted. I do not agree that a sustainable transport network is in place in Berkhamsted.</p> <p><b>23.134</b></p> <p>It is manifest that transport movements will add to congestion on Shootersway while Darrs Lane, a narrow country lane, will require major investment to support the additional traffic. Increased traffic on Darrs Lane will also intensify congestion in Northchurch village centre.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3988
<b>Person ID</b>	1261840
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Your information makes it clear that there will be a challenge for transport links through Berkhamsted Town centre given there is no capacity to improve or widen roads and more houses will mean more traffic especially with Northchurch and South Berkhamsted development when those residents wish to drive through or into the town centre. School drop off and pick ups are already a challenge causing serious jams at peak times, and with a private school in the centre of town many are not from the immediate area anyway adding to congestion. There have been road traffic accidents with a recent death in Northchurch at the narrow section. Delivering houses on the edges of the town and making it a bigger has clear negative consequences on traffic, safety, and lifestyle choices of those currently in the town and the new residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4017
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	23.104 - 2200 homes is not quantified as a % of current properties. 23.104 - What percentage increase in town population? 23.104 - Gut feel is that the town will struggle with 2200 new homes. <b>23.110</b> These Growth Areas will come forward in a comprehensive, cohesive and co-ordinated manner. - WHAT DOES THIS MEAN!! 23.111 - On the other side of the A41?? Building a footbridge? How to access? Air pollution from the A41??? 23.118 - Northchurch will need more retail space and a bigger supermarket!

23.120 - Further traffic calming is required on roads perpendicular to the main road in Berkhamsted. They are rat runs for traffic escaping congestion on the high street. They are dangerous as roads are narrow.

23.123 - Northchurch should have it's own Railway Station. Think BIG

SP20 - I challenge the 2236 dwelling requirement on grounds of need and impact on local area.

The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy does not identify another A41 exit/entrance?? I think it is needed if you go ahead with 2200 new homes.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4076

**Person ID** 1264180

**Full Name** Elaine Woolf

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Comments with reference to Bk01 South of Berkhamsted, but applies to overall growth of the town.

Please look again at the numbers of houses required based on up to date ONS information. The majority of the development is to be built on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have to be shown in order to release Green Belt for Housing development. This has not been demonstrated.

The traffic on London Road is already heavy, and the High Street congested. People will not walk into town from the new development. The topography of the town means that all traffic is funneled through this main artery. An increase in traffic would make the congestion on this road intolerable.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4105
<b>Person ID</b>	488120
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs J Toon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.97 calls Northchurch an 'urban area'. It is not, it is a village. This may have misinformed the proposal for the Northchurch area. I also note that under S6, Table 1 of this Plan Northchurch is not listed as a village. We have a parish council, which is separate from Berkhamsted town council, so this is definitely a separate entity and should be treated as such.</p> <p>23.98 This point mentions the good transport links TO Berkhamsted but completely neglects the inadequacy of transport links INSIDE of Berkhamsted, which will be made worse by the proposed developments.</p> <p>23.99 This point emphasises that key transport links run along the valley floor but again neglects to mention the quality of transport connections from the proposed sites to this key transport link. I think this is important because looking at a map, one can see various roads going from near the proposed sites to the High Street/Shootersway, however, in reality few of these roads are adequate for the existing level of traffic, leave alone for the volumes that the proposed sites would generate. I therefore believe the plan is based on a false premise and should be revised taking into account the real local situation.</p> <p>23.102 This section claims that growth will be transport/accessibility and infrastructure-led but the proposals do not adhere to this principle.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4127
<b>Person ID</b>	1264070
<b>Full Name</b>	Michelle Carnegie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As above re congestion problems, changing the nature of the town significantly with such a large % increase in dwellings, the location is unsustainable and it is predominately on greenbelt land. Furthermore, delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4144
<b>Person ID</b>	1264210
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	myself
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264200
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town post pandemic in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space should allow further green field land to be saved.</p> <p>When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.</p>

Finally the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the amount of development and people using these areas for recreation together with undoubted additional draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4159

**Person ID** 1262892

**Full Name** Jean Farrer

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I reject your view of what is sustainable in Berkhamsted. I have outlined my concerns in other responses. For this section I rely on the BRAG submission to reflect my detailed views.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4269

**Person ID** 1150091

**Full Name** Mr Neil Gallamore

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please register this email as my disagreement to the proposed building of 2236 houses in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Having lived in Berkhamsted for 5 years we have seen the creaking infrastructure in terms of road traffic, school places and doctor appointments, not to mention the increased passenger numbers pre COVID on the trains.</p> <p>Adding in more houses will only increase the pressure on services and take it to an unbearable level. The town will lose its appeal and become even more congested and potentially dangerous for the children who walk to schools.</p> <p>This is a massive mistake as is not backed by the majority of residents in Berkhamsted and no doubt you are seeing from responses already received.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4273
<b>Person ID</b>	1264269
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul de Hoest
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Numerous local groups have commented on this consultation including Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG), Berkhamsted Citizens Association, CPRE, Chiltern Society, Berkhamsted Town Council, Dacorum Green Party, Berkhamsted and Tring Labour Party to name a few. <b>I agree with the stance taken by all of these groups.</b> The fact that all these (and there will be others) are providing the same substantive message from the local population to you should demonstrate that these proposals do not have the support of the people. I do not propose to add to your reading burden by rehashing all of their points</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS4288
<b>Person ID</b>	1264329
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIC MILLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>While exercising around the area noticed excess water coming out of the "Water treatment " plant near the canal, how will the plant cope with the extra "waste" water with thousands of new dwellings proposed?</p> <p>As the road drains, when not blocked - MOST ARE - also drain into the plant via the sewers, cope with the high rainfall this winter and into the future?</p> <p>As for road traffic.....!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4310
<b>Person ID</b>	1264333
<b>Full Name</b>	BARRY PRITCHETT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamsted for 25 years, I strongly object to the amount of housebuilding proposed for the town. It will completely alter the nature of the town that has been designated both by the BBC and the Sunday Times as one of the best places to live in England.</p>

This amount of building will overstretch the resources of the town in terms of road capacity, school and nursery places and healthcare. The lack of local employment opportunities will greatly increase the problem of rush hour congestion.

Hemel Hempstead, which has always been designated for growth, would be a far better place for many of these houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4334

**Person ID** 1264321

**Full Name** David` Fox

**Organisation Details** personal

**Agent ID** 1264318

**Agent Full Name** David  
Fox

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Firstly, the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town, post pandemic (in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space) should allow further green field land to be saved.

When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.

Finally, the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the increased amount of additional development, local traffic and people using these areas for recreation. In addition there will be additional strain on water supplies and inevitable further draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods which will also impact upon the SAC/AONB.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4338
<b>Person ID</b>	1145658
<b>Full Name</b>	mr Steen Dalgas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>My wife and I (address removed) Berkhamsted. We are associated with the One Voice alliance (the Chiltern Society, Chiltern Countryside Group, Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA), Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG), Kings Langley &amp; District Residents Association (KL&amp;DRA), Berkhamsted Citizens and Tring in Transition) and oppose the <u>'Dacorum Local Plan - Emerging Strategy for Growth'</u> because:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1 Whilst the policy on biodiversity is clear, the emerging plan is not explicit enough in terms of <b>how</b> Dacorum Council will work with developers and other stakeholders to mitigate Green Belt loss, increase biodiversity and meet National and Hertfordshire's goals for climate change and carbon reduction</i></li> <li><i>2 The proposed number of houses to be built should be significantly lower than the target to reflect <b>actual demonstrable need</b> for housing and the high proportion of Green Belt and AONB land in Dacorum, with a primary focus on affordable starter homes</i></li> </ol> <p><i>A higher proportion of the houses should be built on brownfield land, or established through conversions, in the existing urban areas of Hemel Hempstead, Tring, Berkhamsted and Kings Langley, and <b>away from areas located in the Green Belt</b> (which should only be used in exceptional circumstances) and the Chilterns AONB and its setting. Please can you ensure that our opposition to the plan for the above reasons is duly noted.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4345
<b>Person ID</b>	1264336
<b>Full Name</b>	IAN MACGILLIVRAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have lived at Northchurch, Berkhamsted, Herts. for more than 8 years. One of the attractions of living here is the wonderful view I have over Nothchurch Common. I am very concerned that the Plan will have a damaging effect on that view and on the Green Belt generally in this area. Although the Council states that a key objective is “minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB”, it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB. It also jeopardises plans, currently under early stages of discussion, to potentially extend the AONB or upgrade its status to that of a National Park. Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, I have serious concerns regarding the sheer scale of proposed development. In my view, the Council has failed to take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>I believe that Local Plans are best developed using an integrated approach that puts climate change, biodiversity, well-being and social inclusion at the centre of the plan. Dacorum Borough Council declared a climate emergency more than a year ago. Despite this and some well-intentioned promises, the Strategy as published clearly prioritises economic growth and greenfield land development over considerations for the climate emergency. In so doing, it has failed to take account of legislation and recommendations from various UK bodies on how carbon reduction plans have to be integral to the development of local plans.</p> <p>Words of ‘encouragement’ are insufficient and no substitute for detailed carbon budgets and committed targets of local carbon reductions. This is a requirement of the NPPF and the 2004 Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act. A carbon reduction plan or pathway is required to meet the current national climate obligations of net zero by 2050 and this work should underpin a revised land use and development strategy. The proposed level of development in Dacorum, along with potential development in neighbouring St Albans City and District, Three Rivers District and in Buckinghamshire east of Aylesbury, would place an unacceptable burden on all types of infrastructure services and facilities in Dacorum. The plan as proposed does little to address the improvements in infrastructure required to support the proposed increase in housing. We have particular concerns regarding the impact on water supply and waste water disposal. The level of new housing proposed is expected to put severe strains on water supplies to Dacorum during the 2020s under drought conditions. In these circumstances there would be no option but to extract additional water from the chalk aquifer which in turn would cause further damage to the Borough’s precious chalk streams. New supplies of water are not likely to be possible until after 2030. The growth proposed by the Strategy would require substantial infrastructure improvements in</p>

order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage. This might take at least ten years to complete, and be extremely expensive as well as disruptive to affected communities.

The Emerging Strategy for Growth appears to be based on documents that have no formal planning status and which have not been widely consulted on. As a result, the Strategy has failed to take account of a number of important issues - the climate emergency, the environmental impact of the proposed development, and the prioritisation of 'brownfield' sites to meet housing needs. The pursuit of economic growth as promoted by the Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership and implied by background work for a South West Herts Joint Strategic Plan, should be balanced against environmental concerns and climate obligations before they are tested through the local plan process.

I am also concerned that the possibility of a link road through our delightful close is again being considered. This would completely destroy its charms and make it a rat run.

I do hope you take my concerns into account and change the proposed Plan accordingly.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4349

**Person ID** 1264340

**Full Name** Ms Joanna Snow

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I am writing to advise that I strongly disagree with the Local Plan to 2038 for Berkhamsted, and the significant housing numbers proposed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4352
<b>Person ID</b>	1148336
<b>Full Name</b>	Giselle Okin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to protest at the excessive housing plans for Berkhamsted and the surrounding areas. Having looked at the plans, I think the numbers planned in Berkhamsted are excessive. I believe the numbers used in the planning are wrong and based on out of data ONS information. They are far in excess of the forecast needed for housing in the area and the infrastructure in the local area will not be able to cope.</p> <p>The plans for West Berkhamsted do not take into consider the already considerably building that has/is taking place in Bearoc Park – the impact of which has not yet been evaluated. I live very near Bearoc Park and know that although it's only half way built, the impact on the traffic on Shootersway is considerable and has increased dramatically at all times of day but especially during rush hour. The roads are frequently backed up from Kingshill Way all the way past Barncroft Road. My children cannot cross the road at Shootersway to get to school because it's too dangerous. I have to take them and it can take ten minutes to cross the road because of the relentless line of traffic.</p> <p>I believe these plans feel like they have been rushed through and should be stopped and thought through with the local infrastructure, the impact on schools and traffic, on pollution and on space for wildlife and green space.</p> <p>I am shocked that so much greenbelt is being desecrated to make space for housing that is far in excess of what's needed in the area.</p> <p>I strongly feel that these plans should be rethought through and paired back considerably.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4357
<b>Person ID</b>	484254
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Janet Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4364
<b>Person ID</b>	1262873
<b>Full Name</b>	Donna Atkinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4372

**Person ID** 1264343

**Full Name** JONATHAN HOAR

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Just wanted to register my objection to the housing proposal in the Local Plan, especially the multiple developments in west Berkhamsted.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4376

**Person ID** 1152050

**Full Name** Mr Christopher Talbot-Ponsonby

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Dacorum Draft Local Plan 2020-2038</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The number of proposed houses far outweighs the capacity of our services such as roads, water usage and sewerage.</li> <li>2. There is not the need for so many houses for the local working population. The users would presumably work in London creating extra pressure on the local road network and train services.</li> <li>3. This does not even take into the account the extra need for Doctors and Schools.</li> <li>4. Developments so close to a busy bypass needs to be built with thought. Has consideration been given to the air quality to those houses?</li> <li>5. The extra traffic generated coming into the town would increase the Nitrogen dioxide levels in the centre of town which is already above WHO guidelines at times.</li> <li>6. Houses should only be built for local actual need and not perceived government assumptions.</li> <li>7. The existing designated Open Spaces in the existing plan within the town should be maintained and kept as they provide essential green lungs within populated residential areas. This will be particularly important if the density of the town is to be increased by the proposed 24%.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4379
<b>Person ID</b>	871443
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Rouse
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Also the high street of adjoining Berkhamsted is already extremely difficult to drive through due to the amount of traffic which uses it. This will only be a lot worse with the proposals which you are putting forward. Very little thought seems to have been given to the quality of life of any of the residents of the area.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4383
<b>Person ID</b>	1264348
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Ronald Irvine Robertson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Plan is based on unrealistic population and housing growth figures, The Office for National Statistics forecasts that the population of England will increase from 56 million in 2018 to 60.8 million in 2038 – an increase of 8.5%. This follows an increase in the previous 18 years of 14% - 49 million in 2000 to 56 million in 2018. The Plan is seeking to increase the housing stock in Dacorum over a slightly shorter period (2020-2038) by around 25%. In Berkhamsted alone we are looking at 2236 new houses on an existing base of 9430 – a 23% increase. Your housing growth projections therefore appear to vastly overestimate the actual need , and this is even before the following recent developments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The recent actual decrease in the population of London – largely due to EU workers returning home.</li> <li>2. The COVID situation leading to more working from home. Therefore a reduced need to be within an easy commuting distance from Central London – the prime reason for Berkhamsted’s growth in the recent past.</li> <li>3. The Government’s expressed aim to concentrate growth in the North of England rather than the affluent South.</li> <li>4. The Government’s recent commitment to preserving the Green Belt, which the Plan seems to largely ignore.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4387
<b>Person ID</b>	1264348
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Ronald Irvine Robertson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The new housing proposed for Berkhamsted is largely in Green Belt areas not easily accessible to the centre of Berkhamsted. The sites are ridge top sites all over a mile from the centre of Berkhamsted and more from the station. There is a steep incline to the sites which coupled with the distance would discourage walking or cycling and would certainly be disadvantageous to elderly people. Car usage would therefore be a requirement for all proposed residents and Berkhamsted already suffers from traffic congestion and poor access to the centre. Furthermore living in the Hall Park area I know that severe weather can make many of the roads running south of the High Street (ie Swing Gate Lane) extremely difficult to drive or walk on. These proposed new developments would therefore become easily isolated.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4390
<b>Person ID</b>	1259206
<b>Full Name</b>	Greg Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The council correctly states in point <b>23.120</b> that there are no new options for road capacity in the tow. The roads are already overcrowded with the residents parked cars on the kerbs and roadside meaning congestion and pollution in the centre of Berkhamsted are already above the WHO recommended levels in the peak traffic times
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4391
<b>Person ID</b>	1146031

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Legge Michael Legge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I strongly object to the proposed development for Berkhamsted on the grounds that it is over development for the town. It will severely impact the infrastructure eg schools, dentists, doctors etc, as well as causing major congestion in the high street and Shootersway and Kingshill Way. I fully appreciate that new homes need to be built but there has been significant development over the last few years eg Bearrock Park etc.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4401
<b>Person ID</b>	1264355
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris and Esther Stewart
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We wish to express our disagreement to the Local Plan for Berkhamsted and the housing numbers proposed, due to the lack of adequate infrastructure and subsequent congestion.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4410

<b>Person ID</b>	1144948
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The plan states earlier that  Berkhamsted currently provides a service centre for surrounding villages so planned local developments, including 2,200 new homes centred on the town, will totally overload the 'densely built-up core' of the town.</p> <p>The claim that 'low property vacancy rates' will need to be reviewed post-pandemic. The plan to improve public transport provision ignores the fact that many people who enjoy the 'thriving evening economy' are from out of town and, ironically, the provision of the Muti-Storey Car Park is likely to lead to greater use of private cars.</p> <p>These are all unintended consequences of a plan that owes much to 'desk top' planning but has little connection with reality.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4427
<b>Person ID</b>	1264378
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicholas Kurth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would be helpful to clarify what the drivers are for the additional housing to be put into the area. Without understanding the background, it seems that the area has accepted a difficult target without any balancing or limiting arguments.</li> <li>- There appears to be minimal attention paid to the preservation of the Green Belt. Indeed, it needs to be demonstrated that a distinctive Green Belt is being maintained around individual towns - I would call it the Duncan Sandys test. Failure to do this will ensure that communities merge into an amorphous mass of London extensions, with all the disadvantages of soulless societies. Without question, it feels that there is a continuing erosion of towns' Green Belts and there needs to be demonstrable criteria applied to avoid this happening.</li> <li>- Being slightly more parochial, I could find no reference to the need for the expansion of medical and dental facilities in Berkhamsted. The current arrangement are already overstretched and unable to cope.</li> <li>- This is little affordable housing in Berkhamsted and development must be directed towards filling this gap. I was appalled that the new Bearroc Park development provided yet more expensive executive homes. I detect the hand of developers here, seeking increased margins. This must stop in order to meet the requirements of all sections of society.</li> <li>- I could find no reference to the need to uplift the funding for facilities support provided to areas. For instance, HCC is currently unable to support the current road network and this level of development will exacerbate the problem.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4470
<b>Person ID</b>	1264316
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Turner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4536
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My family and I moved to Dacorum in 2018 to settle in Berkhamsted for at least the next 25 years. Over this time, we look forward to developing ever stronger links throughout the community and watching our young children grow to adulthood. As such, we have a vested interest in seeing the Borough grow in a way that works for all its citizens – both existing and new.</p> <p>Against this backdrop, I wish to formally state my strong objections to the ‘Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth’. The evidence suggests that, if this plan is approved, your personal legacy will be of considerably worsening towns and communities within the Borough. For new residents moving to the area and for those already here. For all ages. And for all financial situations. I suspect you don’t want to be remembered after you leave this office as the person who caused such damage to an area. So, I ask you to fundamentally rethink.</p> <p>Due to the COVID-19 constraints on travel and mingling for the past year, my experience, and hence prime objection, focuses on the portions of the Local Plan relating to developments in the Berkhamsted area.</p> <p>To summarise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flawed modelling of number and type of housing required would fail to meet the actual needs of the voters moving into the area, whilst disrupting those already here far more than is needed.</li> <li>2. Inadequate commitment to transport infrastructure needs to accommodate the changes proposed would result in a legacy of decades of traffic congestion for voters in Dacorum and visitors to the area.</li> <li>3. Insufficient provision of water supply, wastewater disposal and other infrastructure would leave households with shortages and damage the local water table, with knock-on considerations around subsidence and environmental impact.</li> <li>4. Unworkable assumptions around public transport and foot / bike journeys would see considerable increase to carbon emissions in the Borough and considerable travel delays around vital transport hotspots (town centres, schools, rail stations, etc.).</li> </ol>

5. The above worsening of conditions for the new and existing voters in the area also comes with an ecological cost due to the loss of green belt. If green belt is to be repurposed, it must be done in a way that makes the greatest positive impact for the current and future residents of Berkhamsted. This plan wastes that sacrifice.

These are fundamental flaws in the strategy underpinning the 'Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth'. As such, this plan should be rejected outright, and a new plan drawn up that addresses the actual needs of the area for today and the long-term success of the Borough.

These points are expanded below.

### **\_Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision\_**

Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, the scale of proposed development in Dacorum is out of balance with the long-term needs.

The Local Plan does not take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6, which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Recent Government guidance on calculating housing need has been, at best, confusing. The algorithm for calculating housing need that has been used by the Council is a flawed means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough, based on old data.

The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. Instead, the Local Plan is based on calculations using outdated 2014 based ONS data, which results in a significant overestimate of housing needs.

I note that on 16 December 2020 the UK Government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government also said:

"More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places. ...

Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."

### **\_Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure\_**

Looking at the proposed developments on Green Belt land, there is insufficient consideration in the Local Plan for the provision of new infrastructure or upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments.



Taking a specific example of transportation, consider area 'Bk01 - South of Berkhamsted'. This proposes adding 850 residential units with 2 ways out of the development:

1. Emerging immediately next to a secondary school of over 1300 pupils; and
2. Passing two primary schools on a single, narrow residential road with a 10% gradient and car parking on both sides.

These roads are heavily congested during normal times with the current population – the road by the secondary school backing up during school run times to the main A41 route into and out of the town. Adding 850 households of cars will lead to transport paralysis for the new residents, the homes already in the area, pupils of the schools and people trying to access Berkhamsted from the A41 during peak times.

Similarly, increasing the number of dwelling by over 1,800 in the Berkhamsted area will result in a considerable increase in vehicular traffic through the centre of the town – a route that is already heavily congested at peak times at the A4251 / A416 junction and along the High Street. This is due to the historic layout of the town along a valley with steep sides meaning there are only these two roads into and through the town.

For the increase in population proposed in the Local Plan, there would need to be a considerable extra investment in road widening, traffic flow control measures and new roads to bypass the congestion points inherent with a medieval market town situated in a steep river valley.

#### **Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land**

The Local Plan states that a key objective is “minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB”. This strategic principle is then violated by the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the Council’s self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity.

Noting that 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns AONB, this approach comes at considerable environmental cost.

As such, the Local Plan must be fundamentally reworked to avoid such contradictions in strategic goals and principles.

You are now faced with a personal choice.

Whether to be remembered for taking the easy choice and sticking to an inherently flawed plan that will deeply damage the Borough of Dacorum forever – your lasting legacy – or to take the brave decision and do what is right – to reject the current plan and come back with one based on the actual needs of the current and future voters and households of Dacorum.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4566
<b>Person ID</b>	1262255

<b>Full Name</b>	AJ W
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The starting point for housing delivery is an incorrectly calculated number to begin with and there are no positives within the plan for Berkhamsted as a town. It is simply wrong to prioritise a developer led strategy over and above protection of greenbelt and the health and well being of current and future residents of Berkhamsted. I refer against to the unsustainable nature of these developments and the lack of infrastructure to support them. The transport strategy is not sound. Roads within Berkhamsted cannot cope with current levels of population.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4674
<b>Person ID</b>	1264490
<b>Full Name</b>	PENNY COASE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 In several of the recent years children in Berkhamsted have been unable to secure schooling within the town, both at primary and secondary level</li> <li>2 Traffic is frequently backed up along the High Street particularly going East where slow moving traffic usually extend to St Johns Lane with associated pollution</li> <li>3 Traffic is also frequently backed up through Northchurch in both directions at different times of day with associated pollution</li> </ol>

4 Traffic wishing to join the A41 is backed along Shootersway sometimes as far as Shootersway Park. New housing at Bearroc Park and that being built at Bearroc Park Stage 2 will add to this, with no viable alternative route, again adding to the pollution

5 Access to local countryside is already at bursting point; car parks at Ashridge and other sites such as Gravel Pit at the top of New Road are so full at weekends that cars park on verges leading to degradation of the countryside.

1 Living in Berkhamsted I am particularly concerned about the impact on the town, not because it should be preserved above other areas of Dacorum but simply because I know of the existing issues.

Obviously some extra housing is required but the scale of that proposed is excessive. Furthermore the Plan seems to include little effort to infill smaller areas that could be redeveloped rather encroaching onto Green Belt.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4677

**Person ID** 1264494

**Full Name** AMANDA BEAMON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed developments in Northchurch. They are as follows:

- The number of houses proposed across the borough as a whole is far too high, given that the current infrastructure is already struggling and plans to support this are inadequate
- The need to build on valuable green belt has not been proven. It's is essential for the physical and mental health of current residents, but more importantly it has been designated greenbelt for a reason - we are living in a huge climate crisis and developing precious green land will only exacerbate this and is deeply irresponsible
- there are already significant road traffic issues in the area
- the individual identity of Northchurch has been completely overlooked

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4695
<b>Person ID</b>	1264498
<b>Full Name</b>	TIERNAN GODEL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I feel it necessary to respond and request this development be halted because like everyone else in Northchurch we love our rural setting and our village and want to keep it the way it is.</p> <p>In the main, my objections are -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The over all number of houses proposed - 16,899 across the borough — is just not justified by the latest statistics on projected population growth.</li> <li>- Massive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will cause gridlock in Northchurch High St as well as the 400 houses earmarked for Northchurch itself. Bear in mind the high street in more normal times is already exceptionally busy. This will add more cars on the roads creating further disruptions and have an environmental impact on the air quality.</li> <li>- The grounds for encroaching on the Green Belt have not been made out - the law says we can only build on the Green Belt if it has proven to be necessary - this is simply not the case!</li> <li>- Insufficient value has been put on the Green Belt both in terms our mental and physical wellbeing and the impact on climate change</li> <li>- Northchurch has been written out of existence - it is being subsumed into West Berkhamsted. We feel a strong affinity to the area and wish for it's existence as a separate entity to remain.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4704
<b>Person ID</b>	1264499
<b>Full Name</b>	JENNIFER GUINOT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I feel it necessary to respond and request this development be halted because like everyone else in Northchurch we love our rural setting and our village and want to keep it the way it is.</p> <p>In the main, my objections are -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The over all number of houses proposed - 16,899 across the borough — is just not justified by the latest statistics on projected population growth.</li> <li>- Massive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will cause gridlock in Northchurch High St as well as the 400 houses earmarked for Northchurch itself. Bear in mind the high street in more normal times is already exceptionally busy. This will add more cars on the roads creating further disruptions and have an environmental impact on the air quality.</li> <li>- The grounds for encroaching on the Green Belt have not been made out - the law says we can only build on the Green Belt if it has proven to be necessary - this is simply not the case!</li> <li>- Insufficient value has been put on the Green Belt both in terms our mental and physical wellbeing and the impact on climate change</li> <li>- Northchurch has been written out of existence - it is being subsumed into West Berkhamsted. We feel a strong affinity to the area and wish for it's existence as a separate entity to remain.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4737
<b>Person ID</b>	1264462
<b>Full Name</b>	Penny Clifton

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the automatic inclusion of Northchurch within Berkhamsted. It is a separate community, and its status should be protected as such rather than as a 'suburb'. Care should be taken to protect its separate identity, and some of the proposed areas for development in this plan, such as Darrs Lane, for example, will inevitably 'join up' Northchurch with Berkhamsted, creating an urban sprawl.</p> <p>That aside, this proposed plan does not provide any evidence to justify the need for a dramatic increase in housing in south and west Berkhamsted. My understanding is that the calculations and projections are flawed; the plan gives priority to using green belt land in Berkhamsted and Tring instead of brownfield sites in urban areas</p> <p>Berkhamsted's acknowledged shortcomings in its road infrastructure are overlooked or ignored in this strategy. The 'sustainable travel choices' are not sustainable at all; the town is too hilly for many pedestrians so 'walkable neighbourhoods' are impractical. 'Enhanced cycle provision' might benefit some but if development is permitted on hilltops and hillsides, people will inevitably use cars.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4760
<b>Person ID</b>	1264510
<b>Full Name</b>	Martin Evening
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Nearly all the development proposed in the Dacorum DLP will be on Greenbelt Land. This is against Government Policy. Living in Northchurch the land between Shooters way and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted, absorbing vehicle emissions and noise from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years, which means this Green Buffer is needed more than ever.</p> <p>Berkhamsted lies along a valley with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides and air pollution naturally collect in the area. Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor. Excessive developments will result in poorer air quality. It is also noted that DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-1018. Air quality has not improved since then and recently significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death. Health and well-being are paramount to our communities.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4764
<b>Person ID</b>	1264515
<b>Full Name</b>	SUZANNE JAMES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Loss of Northchurch's Identity. Northchurch has not even been referred to in the proposal, but appears to be renamed as "West Berkhamsted". I have lived here all my life, my parents too. Northchurch is very much its own community and village, separate from Berkhamsted. With two churches, a pub, shops and a thriving cricket club, I am proud of its history, but this proposal appears to rename it as well as threaten to lose its charm and community feeling with an over provision of housing.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4783
<b>Person ID</b>	1264520

<b>Full Name</b>	LINDA LEGGE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development for Berkhamsted. I do appreciate that new homes have to be built but feel this development is far too large. It will impact</p> <p>the local infrastructure of Berkhamsted eg schools, doctors, dentists etc. Even if a new school is built it will do nothing to ease traffic congestion in the High Street, Shootersway and Kingshill Way. There has been a great deal of development in Berkhamsted over the years and I feel this latest plan is too large for the town and will spoil Berkhamsted's unique charm. It will just become an extension of Hemel Hempstead.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4784
<b>Person ID</b>	399110
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jonathan Glaysher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Furthermore, if the number of new homes were to go ahead as proposed then to build them all to the West of the town will create even greater traffic problems in Shootersway, Kingshill Way, Kings Road and environs. We have seen this already following the construction of the Bearroc estate, with Phase 2 in progress – was this taken in to account in the Plan? It is simply unrealistic to suggest that residents would walk or cycle to the Town and High Street from the proposed areas earmarked for new housing. Berkhamsted is, as is acknowledged in the Plan, built in a valley, the walk in to town</p>



would take a minimum of 30 – 40 minutes each way and cycling really isn't practicable except for the fittest given the hills! So we can only expect people to take their cars down to the town causing further congestion and pollution.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4785

**Person ID** 399110

**Full Name** Mr Jonathan Glaysher

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I am also concerned that the infrastructure of the town will not support the proposed increase in housing. We will need more schools, GP Surgeries, local Shops (Convenience Stores) etc. I note that Dacorum will 'support' these developments but will not ensure that they will happen!

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4787

**Person ID** 399110

**Full Name** Mr Jonathan Glaysher

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Finally, Berkhamsted is a nice place to live and the surrounding countryside is beautiful. The proposed development will change this completely and for the worse. The current Green Belt should be preserved for the benefit of existing residents and future generations and, of course, the wildlife and countryside itself.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4813
<b>Person ID</b>	1264527
<b>Full Name</b>	ELAINE RHODES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Secondly the impact on West Berkhamsted in particular is disproportionate; it does not consider existing and recent major developments in the area (e.g. Bearroc) and will put severe pressure on the local infrastructure, drastically increase pollution, congestion, road safety, damage local ecology and generally have a very negative impact on the quality of life for the local residents.  I urge you to reconsider this ill-advised Plan and come up with something more appropriate and sustainable for the future of our town.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4820
<b>Person ID</b>	1264529
<b>Full Name</b>	MARGARET AND JOHN INGRAM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As residents of the Historic town of Berkhamsted for over 40 years we do not want large developments on green belt land which will over load the facilities of the town.</p> <p>Do we NEED these houses</p> <p>This is not environmentally friendly.</p> <p>We cannot stop progress but what about small developments of homes for local people that are affordable, and social homes with affordable rents. Hopefully these would not over load the utilities.</p> <p>Traffic on the High street has already increased to early the amount it was before the A41 bypass was built. We do not want traffic jams.</p> <p>School are already full, and Medical care in the town has had to be rearranged with the increase in population in the Shooters Way development.</p> <p>We enjoy walking in our beautiful local surroundings, without having to get in the car and drive a distance, and would like local residents to be able to do so in the future.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4830
<b>Person ID</b>	1264475
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	23.106 Too much development of green field sites
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4886
<b>Person ID</b>	1263468
<b>Full Name</b>	Bruce Day
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I have referred to these developments elsewhere in my submission but this is the most appropriate place to be specific that the impact of the proposals for the South of Berkhamsted and for the Lock Field promise a dramatic and deleterious effect on the town and connectivity, by whatever means of transport. The possibility of only sixty houses on the Lock Field begs many serious questions for access of any type to school, church, Ashridge and Northchurch centre. The possibility that the developments to the south might introduce a further access to the A41, in addition to the hazardous one from Bourne End Mills creates a definite hazard.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5016
<b>Person ID</b>	1264554
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Malcolm Allen

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman South West Herts Conservative Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Objections. Site selection.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The policy states that the Settlement Hierarchy is there to ensure that new development takes place in suitable locations that have the best access to a wide range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. <b>In Berkhamsted it doesn't.</b> The new plan is contrary to the Locational and other Principles set out in para 4.10 to the plan (ref A) which emphasises <i>Use Brownfield sites</i>. Only a few in Berkhamsted are located thus. Others are on Green Belt and a sports field.</li> <li>2 <i>'Maximum Density but ensure it meets local character' and 'respect the character of the existing settlement and restrict urban sprawl.'</i> Apart from Blk 01, the Swing Gate Lane site for 850 houses, the Plan crams 630 houses along the south Berkhamsted ridge (Blks 02,03,04,05,10) which is an area with mainly detached houses in large gardens with easy access to the Green Belt and walks. Such development will entirely change the character of this residential area. Besides we know that Berkhamsted has already exceeded Core Strategy plans by at least 34%.</li> <li>3 <i>'Ensure the new development can be served by the necessary infrastructure.'</i> We lack sports, medical and mental health facilities. This is a real concern as there is already a shortage of playing fields, doctors and dentists in the town and waiting times are increasing as are journey times to Watford Hospital. The Local Plan needs to provide hard facts instead of vague promises about the essential facilities these planned sites will have and who will fund them.</li> <li>4 We have real concerns about the water supply. In recent years the aquifer serving south Berkhamsted has been critically low. Nothing in the plan shows how this is to be addressed. The impact of more building on our chalk streams will be adverse. In fact the impact of this plan on bio-diversity could be disastrous and has not been addressed,</li> <li>5 There is no evidence to show the population growth to support the extra housing. 72% of respondents to the previous consultation said there was no need for a large increase in jobs, particularly offices, in view of changing work practices. 56% said they did not approve of the method of selecting future job sites. Table 3.18 (ref A) shows Housing Stock total 9,430 and the number of net homes 805. The definition of net homes remains unclear?</li> <li>6 When it comes to <i>'Implications for Growth'</i> it is not clear where the figures come from. The Plan describes a process where <i>'Vision is set, and necessary interventions are developed to meet the visions.'</i> This suggests the chosen</li> </ol>

process has the inherent danger of a **strong selective bias towards data which can be interpreted to support the “vision” in preference to more valid data which demonstrates the impracticality of that same “vision”.**

- 7 The assessments of individual sites fails to show fully the impact they may have on the specific area in which they are situated. The cumulative impact of development on several small Green Belt sites is ignored. Development on Green Belt cannot offer any net “*environmental enhancements*”. For example, building on Haslams Field cannot enhance bio-diversity, encourage wild life and encourage walking and this latest plan increases the number of houses planned for this site, The net effect can only be negative regardless of size and the larger the development the greater the negative effect.
- 8 We have been unable to find DBC’s policy on sport and recreational facilities but if Berkhamsted is to have nearly 2,000 new houses in addition to the 1,100 under construction it will need somewhere for sport and recreation. None of this provision is evident. Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charity Association states that there is a critical shortage of football, cricket and hockey pitches. As most of this new development will be in South Berkhamsted, Haslam Field should be retained as a sports field. After all it was gifted to Berkhamsted school for sport not financial gain.

### **Objections. Transport.**

- 1 Berkhamsted is a linear/valley market town with narrow streets and with a station in the centre of the town. Parking is a major headache now and this development is likely to generate extra car journeys a day per car. Assuming each new house has two cars, the average for Berkhamsted, we can expect around 15000 more journeys in and out.
- 2 The Plan constantly recognises that transport is problematical in Berkhamsted because of its topography. Figure 3.12 etc (Ref C) clearly indicates that walking and cycling from the Berkhamsted ridge sites is unfeasible and people will drive. The roads they will use are narrow and the two/three car families mean street parking is the norm. The 630 houses referred to in paragraph 10 above, including Hanbury’s which is already allocated, and the 260 houses in Blks 06 and 07 would also use Shooterway, Kings Road and Crossoak Road to access the town. These roads have narrow or no pavements. Shootersway is used by children and parents walking to and from school. There will also be a huge impact by Heavy Goods Vehicles supporting the building projects. Kings Road is just about wide enough for two-way but not for trucks in some places. There is a school at the lower end. Crossoak Road has a single lane section. Then, of course, there is air pollution to consider especially in the town centre valley.
- 3 There are no plans to improve access on to the A41 so at rush hour we can expect huge congestion around the entry and exit junction and the feeder routes on to it including from Chesham which is also scheduled for a large development. Such congestion already occurs regularly now.
- 4 The Transport Vision again finds ways to underpin an accepted ‘*sound local plan*’. Para 3.10 (ref B), the ‘*Adopted Hierarchy*’ is a wish list which puts car and truck usage at the lower end of the priorities when everything in the study points to increased car usage and journeys. The statement that ‘*sustainable transport is a real option as public transport is more reliable, rapid, flexible, convenient and under used*’ is not supported by evidence.

- 5 Once again it is shown that cycling is not an option because of the topography. Para 4.16 (ref B) clearly indicates that that the vast majority of the 3,964 journeys quoted will be by vehicle via the A41 with its single entrance from Berkhamsted.
- 6 Para 4.21 (ref B) states that rail connections from St Albans and Watford are better than in Berkhamsted which is in direct contrast to the statement in 2.3 which says '*we are well placed to shift longer strategic journeys onto rail.*' There is no definition of a '*strategic journey*'? The key information is that most commutes are by car, 83% outbound and 61% inbound and table 4.9 shows that car is the dominant means of commuting and that cycling commuting is low. That means the A41 and its single access point.
- 7 The introduction to the Transport Study states that its aim is to '*develop the transport evidence base for the local plan.*' We have concluded that this encourages the selection only of evidence to support decisions already made. The Plan acknowledges that the topography of Berkhamsted makes cycling and walking difficult yet goes on to produce ideas about cycle lanes, bike parks and restricted traffic in the High Street. Few people, especially older people and shoppers, will walk up and down the steep hills from their homes to the town centre particularly as their routes which, even now, are congested and polluted rat runs.
- 8 There is no evidence that the developers of each site will pay anything towards improving roads and paths. One only has to look at the minimum work done on Shootersway by the Bearroc developers.

**Conclusion.**

- 1 The lifestyle changes which will be created by Covid and Brexit mean that the Local Plan has unavoidably been overtaken by events of such magnitude that its focus on a single target for new housing cannot be sustained. Even using the information and studies that are the basis of the Plan we have severe doubts that 630 houses along the South Berkhamsted Ridge and the 260 houses in Blks 06 and 07 (Darrs Lane and Lock Field) are needed or are in the right places. Indeed 850 dwellings south of Swing Gate stretches the imagination. Further, the topographical limitations of Berkhamsted will mean the development will adversely affect the road, rail and public transport facilities as they stand. It is doubtful if the planned expenditure to improve through routes and encourage cycling and walking will have any marked benefit, even if it were guaranteed which it is not.
- 2 In the light of the above and the scale of the implications of the current Government's major 'rethink' we suggest that the wealth of DBC data and knowledge, including the responses to this Consultation, is reshaped from a single target plan into a series of linked sub-plans contingent on the results of the new figures as they are announced in the next few months. This reshaping will have the great benefit that it will provide the total envelope for the possible new policies plus allow greater agility and speed to implement the new requirements as they are announced.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5020

**Person ID** 1262210

<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE BURTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5042
<b>Person ID</b>	1264557
<b>Full Name</b>	Natalie Crane
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS5072
<b>Person ID</b>	1264258
<b>Full Name</b>	Fintan FitzPatrick
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p> <p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p>

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5164

**Person ID** 1264544

**Full Name** Bethan Fox

**Organisation Details** Personal comment

**Agent ID** 1264539

**Agent Full Name** Bethan  
Fox

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Firstly, the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town, post pandemic (in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space) should allow further green field land to be saved.

When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.

Finally, the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the increased amount of additional development, local traffic and people using these areas for recreation. In addition, there will be additional strain on water supplies and inevitable further draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods which will also impact upon the SAC/AONB.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5177

**Person ID** 1264509

**Full Name** Hannah Fox

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly, the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town, post pandemic (in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space) should allow further green field land to be saved.</p> <p>When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.</p> <p>Finally, the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the increased amount of additional development, local traffic and people using these areas for recreation. In addition, there will be additional strain on water supplies and inevitable further draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods which will also impact upon the SAC/AONB.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5232
<b>Person ID</b>	1264608
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Beadle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly, the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town, post pandemic (in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space) should allow further green field land to be saved.</p>

When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.

Finally, the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the increased amount of additional development, local traffic and people using these areas for recreation. In addition, there will be additional strain on water supplies and inevitable further draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods which will also impact upon the SAC/AONB.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5269

**Person ID** 1175740

**Full Name** Berkhamsted Schools Group

**Organisation Details** The Berkhamsted Schools Group

**Agent ID** 1175743

**Agent Full Name** Kevin Rolfe

**Agent Organisation** Group Director, Development & Planning  
Aitchison Raffety

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**BERKHAMSTED DELIVERY STRATEGY**

We support the DBC general development strategy, that as the second largest town, Berkhamsted should take a proportionate level of growth. The BSG is prepared to play its part in assisting the delivery of such growth via enhanced offerings for education; sport, and local infrastructure improvements to benefit the wider community.

The BSG supports DBC in producing a delivery strategy in line with government requirements. We specifically support the proposed housing allocation of 150 homes at Haslam Field Shootersway, site BK03. We also support the specific allocation of land at Haresfoot as the receptor site for an enhanced sporting provision, allocation Cy04.

We welcome the fact that the plan acknowledges that “The independent school sector also plays an important educational and community role in the town.”

Berkhamsted School is the largest education provider and employer in the town. In the Oxford Economics 2018 economic impact report it showed that, at that time, the BSG not only employed 530 local people directly, but also supported over

1000 jobs via its activities. The local contribution to GDP was then more than £27m and it generated a total saving in excess of £12m for UK taxpayers as a result of attendance at the BSG schools, rather than taking up a free UK state school place.

The BSG is accommodating a modest growth in student numbers and continues to invest in its estate as part of its strategic development plans.

It is acknowledged that growth brings challenges in terms of local infrastructure, but we agree with DBC and their expert advisors that such growth can be managed in a positive way alongside infrastructure improvements.

Within **Policy SP20-Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted** it is stated that “Growth Areas will come forward in a comprehensive, cohesive and co-ordinated manner. Their scale offers benefits for infrastructure co-ordination and delivery, enabling a fuller range of site and town-wide infrastructure needs to be considered”

The BSG agrees with the principle that a coordinated approach to growth is required and will continue to cooperate with DBC and will engage with other stakeholders when appropriate to agree any reasonable linked aspects. We do however also consider that great care is needed to ensure that each site is also assessed on its own merits having regard to the location, size, ease and speed of delivery and potential community benefits that flow.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5270
<b>Person ID</b>	1175740
<b>Full Name</b>	Berkhamsted Schools Group
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Berkhamsted Schools Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	1175743
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Kevin Rolfe
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Group Director, Development & Planning Aitchison Raffety
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Policy SP21</b> deals with delivering Growth in “South Berkhamsted” which is an area described by DBC as containing the BSG site BK03 as well as sites BK01, BK02, BK04, BK09, and BK10.  It is clear that this policy area is dominated by proposed growth from site BK01 for 850 homes and we consider this to be geographically distinct and of a different scale to the BSG site at BK03.

We are not party to the timing/availability of site BK02 (BFI) and site BK10 already has planning consents at Hanburys immediately adjoining the BSG land. BK04 is understandably linked with BK03, being alongside the rear part and including a potential access route through the BSG land. BK09 is a distinct small site in a completely separate area of the town from the BSG site. We do not think therefore that it is entirely correct for site BK03 to be described and linked in such a definitive way to some of the sites further afield and appropriate flexibility should apply to the policies in order to enable an early delivery solution for site BK03.

**Policy SP21** states that the Council “will prepare the Masterplan for the whole of the South Berkhamsted Growth Area and this will be adopted as an SPD. The Masterplan will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes which will inform subsequent planning applications. These will be prepared in collaboration with key partners and landowners and be supported by community and stakeholder involvement”

As stated above, we fully understand the need for some coordination of growth in Berkhamsted and it is acknowledged that specific design detailed proposals will need to be worked up on sites. We will engage with DBC on the detail of the above but it should be recognised that the BSG site BK03 is ready to come forward quickly. It has its own acceptable road frontage for access. The early delivery is linked to enhanced sporting provision at site Cy04, that has numerous wellbeing and community benefits. An early planning permission and sale of BK03 will ensure that the BSG can invest in various projects and continue to enhance local infrastructure for wider community benefit. The early housing numbers from site BK03 can count towards DBC land supply quickly. In summary, site BK03 has specific characteristics that justifies some flexibility, and its delivery should not be held back by issues that may arise or be appropriate to other large projects elsewhere. We do not currently understand why an overall masterplan for all these combined sites would be appropriate due to distinct locations and sizes. It is acknowledged that detailed site-specific design aspects would need to be agreed. We will continue to discuss these detailed matters with DBC as the plan evolves.

In conclusion, whilst we accept that site BK03 is within an area generally described as South Berkhamsted in a geographical sense, it does not have close links with the other sites other than site BK04 to the rear. Policy SP2 is therefore considered rather prescriptive and may not have enough flexibility to allow site specific characteristics to be taken into account to ensure an early phase delivery for site BK03.

**Policy SP21** refers to the Draft IDP and Berkhamsted specific/site specific schedules. We comment more on detailed highway aspects in a later section of our submission. We agree in general that a comprehensive approach to infrastructure is needed but the way it is funded, its timing and the level of contribution from each site will need detailed further engagement with DBC officers in parallel with the local plan making process. For example, the contributions for Berkhamsted sites are currently shown as c £31,000 per unit which excludes highway improvements. There is already an established CIL payment process throughout DBC including a substantial £250/m<sup>2</sup> indexed for Berkhamsted. This CIL is specifically intended to be used for investment in infrastructure. There will also be other external funding sources such as HCC/government. Any offsite highway works contributions must be reasonably related to the specific impact of the site itself. The final level of infrastructure needed will go hand in hand with what final level of growth is accepted and this may yet change. In summary, detailed engagement is needed with DBC on the above. What is clear is that BSG will invest back into the local community quickly and directly in many ways, to wider benefit.

We acknowledge that there will be strong objections to the level of growth proposed and it is possible that the final level of growth in Berkhamsted could yet be proposed to change for political reasons. The very recent government guidance published since the draft plan was produced for consultation states that the housing numbers should increase. As stated previously it is our strong case that regardless of the final level of growth adopted, that site BK03 is the most appropriate of any sites for early release from the green belt.

When large scale growth is involved there are risks of delays and challenges along the way. The DBC plan must have due regard to the fact that site BK03 can come forward quickly and independently of other wider proposals. It would be inappropriate for the delivery of BK03 to be derailed by wider issues that are not directly linked. Early plan period housing delivery of sites such as BK03 are important to maintain the DBC housing land supply, whilst delivery evolves on the larger projects.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5297

**Person ID** 1264532

**Full Name** Robert Clarke

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The creation of nearly 2,000 homes will be completely unsustainable to all the facilities in Berkhamsted. In particular for transport, medical services of hospital services and surgeries which are already over stretched.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5340

**Person ID** 1264616

**Full Name** Philip Daw

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5376
<b>Person ID</b>	1264599
<b>Full Name</b>	Mike Keeble
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There is one road that runs through the middle of Berkhamsted and Northchurch. This is already congested, further development will only make this worse.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5493
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647



<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5512
<b>Person ID</b>	1264048
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The new estates must have decent sized parks and green corridors. I would also question that that many homes are going to be needed in Berkhamsted, (Brexit and Covid, more people working from home may mean people can live in less expensive parts of the country and won't want to move to Dacorum).
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5526
<b>Person ID</b>	1262731

<b>Full Name</b>	Julie Battersby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	23.124. It is not true that the air quality in Northchurch High St has not exceeded set thresholds recently. I attach evidence from Air Quality England that proves averaged hourly PM10 Particulate Matter exceeded the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 limit values on eight days in 2019. Furthermore, despite reduced road traffic used due to Covid, this occurred for both Nitrogen Dioxide and PM10 Particulate Matter levels on one day in 2020. Mitigation proposals should be in place before development is approved because afterwards it is too late - as we see by the evidence for Northchurch. Air pollution in the medium term is likely to increase if traffic flow through the town increases. The consultation should be withdrawn until tangible mitigation measures are set out and proven to be effective.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Evidence Air Quality 2019.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5541
<b>Person ID</b>	1264651
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Beecroft
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There is no mention of Northchurch in the Delivery Strategy, which has a distinctly different, more rural feel to the adjacent town of Berkhamsted.  The Strategy does not assess the impact of traffic, overcrowding and the quality of life that will affect my family and my community.

Being based far from the town centre and on a steep hill one of the proposed development in Northchurch would allow residents to walk to any amenities and therefore, the locations are neither sustainable nor environmentally friendly.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5557

**Person ID** 1264491

**Full Name** Paul Wade

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5647

**Person ID** 1264689

**Full Name** Philip Hobden

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist. The UK only produces about 50% of its food requirements and hence is a security risk in the event of a pandemic affecting food supplies. Where land is being used or can be used for agricultural purposes this should not be used for building except in exceptional circumstances.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5685
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The development in Berkhamsted such as site 18 will reduce wildlife corridors and not achieve the objectives of 23.112, where are these proposals?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5695
<b>Person ID</b>	1264405
<b>Full Name</b>	Natalie Beecroft
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There is no mention of Northchurch in the Delivery Strategy, which has a distinctly different, more rural feel to the adjacent town of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The Strategy does not assess the impact of traffic, overcrowding and the quality of life that will affect my family and my community.</p> <p>Being based far from the town centre and on a steep hill one of the proposed development in Northchurch would not allow residents to walk to any amenities and therefore, the locations are neither sustainable nor environmentally friendly.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5706
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5733
<b>Person ID</b>	1264678
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom A

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5865
<b>Person ID</b>	335042
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Edwards
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am objecting to the planned developments to the South West of Berkhamsted, essentially filling in all the land between Shootersway and the A41 bypass. Leaving aside the fact that most of these homes would suffer from the constant noise from the bypass, they will generate a large increase in traffic. These developments will have no local shopping amenities. Their distance from the town centre means that many journeys into town are likely to be made by car. As there is no additional employment planned in the town, the assumption must be that work travel will also involve commuting. The roads in Berkhamsted are already congested and traffic on Shootersway in particular has grown as a result of recent

development. This road, and others nearby, is used by children to walk to schools yet is already unsafe due to its narrow pavement. Cross Oak Road in parts has no footway at all. These roads are not suitable for increased traffic.

The plan makes many worthy points, including, under transport: “We need to plan for a low carbon and less car-dominated future. We need to move towards more sustainable and active forms of travel, particularly for those shorter journeys within our towns and villages...”.

Yet there seems to be no detail in the plan for how this traffic might be managed or how cycling or walking are to be promoted. There is only a statement: “We are continuing to develop the transport proposals that will be included within the Plan...”

I do not believe these developments to the South West of Berkhamsted should be allowed unless or until it can be shown how the additional traffic will be managed. There should be consideration to changing roads to pedestrian/cycle/local access only, perhaps new junctions onto the A41.

There are alternative locations to the East of the town including Bulbourne Cross that can offer better local amenities and road links.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5894

**Person ID** 1264354

**Full Name** Juliet Penaliggon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Firstly, the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town, post pandemic (in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space) should allow further green field land to be saved.

When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.

Finally, the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the increased amount of additional development, local traffic and people using these areas for recreation. In addition, there will be additional strain on water supplies and inevitable further draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods which will also impact upon the SAC/AONB.

How can the plan propose to deliver 'a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' when wildlife corridors will be removed, and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants? In addition, if the Thakeham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.

It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5895

**Person ID** 1264752

**Full Name** Chris Brown

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

In earlier responses I have highlighted flaws behind this Local Plan.

Given the housing targets promote a dangerously flawed starting point and DBC's vision for Berkhamsted is contrary to the health and wellbeing of current and future residents, I find it impossible to agree in any way with DBC's Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy.

In short, this is a strategy that prioritises developer lead demand over protection of the Green Belt or the health and wellbeing of both current and future residents.



Policy SP1 really isn't worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Masterplans to the detriment of both the development and community, while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as "successful new communities", "best approach to", "best practice", "comprehensive green infrastructure", "multifunctional space", "an exemplar in sustainable living" etc. etc. etc.

I particularly take issue with "5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy."

As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted, while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport.

Likewise, "6. an exemplar in sustainable living with a particular focus on reducing energy consumption as well as generating energy from renewable and low carbon sources and delivering other significant environmental enhancement to ensure climate resilience" is simply an aspirational mantra with no hard and fast policy to back it up. All new developments need to be carbon neutral and anything less is failing to display any serious commitment to overall carbon reductions.

And then point 7 assures us that DBC will "deliver the infrastructure requirements set out in the Dacorum Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Berkhamsted". Unfortunately, there is nothing in this plan that suggests the infrastructure issues will be addressed.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5943
<b>Person ID</b>	1264785
<b>Full Name</b>	Thomas Lloyd-Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As the Berkhamsted residents association points out,
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6025
<b>Person ID</b>	1264822
<b>Full Name</b>	JULES GARNER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plan do not take into consideration the increase in traffic in Berkhamsted caused by movement of new residents as most of the developments will require car travel as they are on the edge of town. The valley shape of the town funnels all vehicles into a few central smaller roads to access all shops, train station and services. Private cars are the only means of transport as cycling is not practical for families where younger children struggle to manage the hills. The town will become unsafe for children who are currently able to walk to their local school in terms of car accident risk and the associated pollution.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6062
<b>Person ID</b>	1264848
<b>Full Name</b>	Ed Snow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to advise that I strongly disagree with the Local Plan to 2038 for Berkhamsted, and the significant housing numbers proposed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6104
<b>Person ID</b>	1264797
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Flawed windfall calculations and projections lead to a faulty delivery strategy that seems to prioritise building on Green Belt, over brownfield and urban development, contrary to the NPPF. There are no infrastructure improvements in Berkhamsted for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6213
<b>Person ID</b>	1264872
<b>Full Name</b>	Ben Penaliggon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly, the plan should be based on the 2018 ONS numbers which would project half the requirement of houses currently laid out - this should proportionally halve the amount of green belt currently required to be developed. Another look at brown field sites within the town, post pandemic (in view of the trend towards home working freeing up office/ commercial space) should allow further green field land to be saved.</p> <p>When the A41 was built the intention was for the much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides.</p> <p>Finally, the fact that Berkhamsted and Tring border the Chiltern Beeches SAC and AONB is incompatible with the increased amount of additional development, local traffic and people using these areas for recreation. In addition, there will be additional strain on water supplies and inevitable further draining of the chalk aquifer during dry periods which will also impact upon the SAC/AONB.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6229
<b>Person ID</b>	1261819
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Rathmell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Berkhamsted and Northchurch centres is extremely limited, via a small number of single-track country lanes. Widening these lanes would involve significant habitat destruction as hedgerows and field boundaries are destroyed.</li> <li>• Additional traffic will inevitably use Granville Road as a cut-through to avoid an increasingly congested high street. The road is already used this way, and should be speed limited to 20mph. As this worsens, the danger to children and pets from traffic will increase, and the effects of air pollution (recently cited in court as a cause of death for the first time) will become more serious.</li> </ul>

- The housing development will place a large green area under concrete. I believe this presents a risk of flooding and ground saturation for the south side of Granville Road, which experiences run-off from the higher ground, as the ground will no longer be able to absorb heavy rainfall. This will worsen as the climate changes and becomes wetter in winter.
- In future summer drought conditions, which are certain to increase, the extra demand for water caused by the new development will contribute to depletion of the area's internationally important chalk streams.
- The direct pollution caused by the construction of the new developments will be significant, in the form of dust and particulate matter, noise, and emissions from heavy vehicles.
- I am concerned that this temporary pollution and the permanent pollution caused by new housing and associated vehicle movements will be concentrated in our valley location.
- The habitat destruction that will be caused by the proposed Northchurch developments alone will be devastating. The area around Bell Lane is rich with hedgerow wildlife, including endangered species like hedgehogs and dormice. Similarly, the proposed development along the canal would destroy a habitat for kingfishers (many people walk the canal towpath in Northchurch just to see these beautiful birds - they will not survive the proposed development), herons and numerous other species that value the wet habitat and proximity to the canal. This would also destroy a wildlife corridor that runs along the canal.
- Both the proposed Northchurch developments will spoil the enjoyment of the countryside for local people and visitors. In our case, it will push the countryside further away from our children. Walkers on the other side of the valley along the public footpath between Norcott Hill and the B4506 (part of the Ashridge estate) will no longer see a rural view of a relatively undeveloped Chiltern valley, they will see an urban sprawl . Walkers along the canal will find themselves walking first alongside a building site and then yet another housing development, instead of dense vegetation rich in wildlife.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6263

**Person ID** 1264834

**Full Name** Ilina Jha

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* **Yes**  
 \* **No**

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6283
<b>Person ID</b>	1264913
<b>Full Name</b>	ian Stephenson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I have a number of comments that I wish to make regarding the proposals for Berkhamsted. These are in the attached document. Ian Stephenson
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Berkhamsted - Objections to the Proposed Local Plans .pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6330
<b>Person ID</b>	1264629
<b>Full Name</b>	Claudia Selina
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Delivery Strategy as part of this consultation is incomplete, as it does not include plans for the proposed new houses between Bourne End and Berkhamsted, named Bullbourne Cross and outlined in <a href="https://www.bulbournecross.co.uk/vision">https://www.bulbournecross.co.uk/vision</a></p> <p>Considering this is a proposal, which is to be realised before 2038, it should have been included in the Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy.</p> <p>I formally object to the proposed plans due their incompleteness and lack of transparency how transport links, road network, schools and other amenities will be upgraded to enable proposed growth as outlined in this plan.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6408
<b>Person ID</b>	1264750
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6504
<b>Person ID</b>	1264936
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Cracknell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Development of land 850 homes south of Berkhamsted. These homes are planned on open field sites which are regularly used as leisure areas by local residents. Homes here are dependent on private cars for getting to and from the town and will greatly increase traffic in Berkhamsted and on local roads near schools. The area is above the rest of the town so development here will be very obvious and will not blend in with the town as would developments at a lower level. The large number of homes suggested will change the character of the area considerably.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6523
<b>Person ID</b>	1264916
<b>Full Name</b>	Kathryn Spall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This strategy prioritises building on Green Belt land over urban development which is contrary to the national planning guidelines. Congestion is already bad in the town centre - it could not cope with the additional influx that 2000 + homes would bring. The Green Belt should be protected.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6619
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist. I support the previous submission by BRAG that showed a report that contained 'confirmation bias' and this report has been placed on record.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6677
<b>Person ID</b>	1265045
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanne Loch
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to submit my objections to the proposed Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038.</p> <p>To begin with, there are several personal reasons for my objection, and then I will go into the effects on my neighbours and local community.</p> <p>I have chosen to live and bring up my young family here in Northchurch because of the proximity to rural and natural landscapes. This is essential for my mental well-being, and yet even now, it can be difficult to find enough spots for</p>

walking and exercise that are not already swarming with other people doing the same. This has changed hugely over the last ten years and especially the last few years with other big housing developments in the areas such as Bearroc Park, as well as smaller additions that seem to creep in. Before this I felt that the surrounding area to Northchurch and Berkhamsted was an area of wonderfully unspoilt countryside, but it is becoming increasingly like other over crowded towns such as St Albans (which I have lived in and had to leave) because of the high population, road noise and pollution and over-crowded streets, shops and services. This is really sad and also creates an urban existence which of course as you must already know, that is not what we live here for.

Health issues of my own such as asthma, mean that I need to access good quality, clean air, which is already threatened on our walk to St Marys School with the pollution from clogged up traffic on the Northchurch High Street and New Road.

The high volume of through traffic has already been an issue of safety at the road crossing on the Northchurch High Street, and honestly walking up the very narrow path to visit friends who live further up New Road, feels terribly dangerous, most especially for those of us with younger children. As you know, we suffered the death of a young girl in recent years who was crossing the road at the high street. With a huge increase in traffic, it would be necessary to have many more points of traffic lights for pedestrian safety. Of course, this then causes a back log of traffic congestion, adding to pollution and so on.

This is all without the addition of your proposed housing developments. And the disruption of the work being carried out. The thought of large vehicles passing while walking with children up New Road is frightening. I have even been knocked by a passing van on occasion when walking my children to school. More should be done about the clogged up roads and there should be council work done to improve the safety around the school and church areas, yet instead these plans are only going to serve in making the situation far worse.

Having always appreciated our beautiful countryside, I have always been so thankful for the GreenBelt protection, and always felt that we were lucky to have this and not suffer the effects of losing all of the natural and rural areas as we have sadly seen in other areas. I am absolutely shocked and appalled that this can apparently be over-ridden? This cannot be right? Who on earth would think that this is a good idea? When the planet is already struggling, losing native species of wildlife, devastating our beautiful protected green belt should be the last thing that any council suggests. There is so much information on climate change out there, I presumed that our local authorities would be doing everything that they can to keep us, and all the local wildlife, healthy and happy within our greenbelt protection.

If the Pandemic has taught us anything, surely the need and right for every human to have access to exercise in nature has been high on all of our lists.

Northchurch itself is a historical village, with community around the school and churches, and yet it is already being stretched outwards by housing developments. If we do this to our villages we will be just one mass of housing estates with the odd green patch here and there, with no natural barrier to protect the character and beauty of the area.

Neighbours on our road have lived here for decades and we love it as a village in its own right. Our personal choice was to move here from central Berkhamsted, to escape some of the hustle and bustle, overcrowding, traffic issues and to be closer to the rural end of the area. It seems that Northchurch is being seen as an extension of Berkhamsted, and simply an easy route to add on a huge amount of housing at no doubt premium prices, with absolutely no regard to the current residents and their well-being. The increases that this would cause in traffic, pollution, population, waiting lists and general queuing everywhere is horrendous, without the loss of our beautiful surroundings as well. What would make anyone want to do this?

Many of the people living in my area of Northchurch are elderly, and being able to take local walks, visit supermarkets and amenities are all important yet have you ensured that they have their say in this? There would be years of disruption in the surrounding area, more traffic and pollution, yet I feel this age group have been somewhat forgotten in your pledge to build more houses. It is not only for young families to be considered in villages and town planning. Northchurch has always been a quiet and peaceful place to live, and perfect for retirement. The already increased volume of traffic and busyness in local shops is already threatening this.

**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS6731**Person ID** 1265084**Full Name** Timothy Cooke**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to register my objection to the proposals within the Local Plan and in particular their impact on Berkhamsted.

Two points:

1) Berkhamsted has natural boundaries formed through a combination of geography, the adjacent Green Belt plus areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). These boundaries also serve to constrain the transport and road infrastructure, retail activity and other services. The proposals within The Plan fail to acknowledge these constraints and as such are deficient in a number of ways, not least in seeking to squeeze significant numbers of new dwellings into the limited space but more particularly in that they have little or no recognition of the impact on services and by extension the quality of life for new residents and those already living in the town. Any proposal to increase population levels by such a significant percentage would normally require detailed assessments of the supporting infrastructure. The Plan instead attempts to squeeze a quart out of a pint pot and leave it to others to determine how to solve the consequent pressures on services.

2) The use of land in and adjacent to the green belt sets an unwelcome and highly contentious precedent that is bound to be exploited in future planning applications. My understanding is that the Core Strategy established by DBC in 2013 recognised the importance of the rural environment and I am unable to reconcile those stated principles with the proposals contained in The Plan. It should also be noted that developers already hold tracts of green belt in their local land banks and are waiting for the opportunity to secure planning permission. They will view The Plan as an encouragement to their longer term ambitions.

I urge the Council to rethink the proposals and to place much greater emphasis on protecting the green belt and ensuring that planned urban growth is centred on areas which have the available infrastructure and capacity to meet the needs of residents old and new.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6746
<b>Person ID</b>	1264697
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicholas Wood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

## Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment

I would like to register my opposition in the strongest possible terms to the entirety of this plan for Berkhamsted.

Unlike the council planners who have clearly thought this up, I live in Berkhamsted and the myriad flaws in it are therefore immediately obvious to me. Like, for starters, where the hell do you plan to put a new 6FE secondary school?

But I get ahead of myself. I have many objections, but lets stick to the big four.

First, let's start at the beginning with the methodology of your Local Plan. Your plans to push the largest number of housing units on Dacorum that you possibly can, using figures that are based on out of date metrics pre Brexit and pre Covid and are a totally flawed and out of date set of forecasts. You ignore the momentous changes of the last five years and ignore the following facts. 1 - it is estimated that 1.3M EU citizens have left them UK post Brexit and Covid, massively reducing the demands on UK housing provision. 2 - the home working revolution caused by Covid means there will be much less demand for housing in traditional commuter towns like Tring and Berkhamsted. 3 - vast swathes of town centres are going to come available for housing as physical retail is destroyed by online shopping. 4 - the end of EU free movement to the UK means population growth will be massively subdued. Berkhamsted will not need anything like the number of houses you propose in your Developers Charter/ 'Local Plan'.

Secondly, Berkhamsted cannot take the housing increases you suggest without severely damaging the quality of life of its residents. Take traffic for example. You yourselves state ' there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town'. Any resident knows that Charles street and Lower Kings Road are gridlocked every morning. Yes you built a new car park ( in the teeth of local opposition, because we all knew you use it against us one day ) but Berkhamsted still has only two major roads and a single all important crossroad; that's the reality of this linear valley town. 2000 homes on the fringes of the town will add massively to this congestion. And with school's the situation will be even worse. We've only just recovered from the massive reorganisation of Berkhamsted schools in 2012/13 brought about by the building of Bearroc Park, there's no way we can accommodate the children that 2000 homes would bring. There's simply no space for three new schools with adequate playing field provision once you've built over all the green belt land that's not AONB ( including the actual school playing fields at Hallam Fields!)

Thirdly, your plan is a sustainability and ecological disaster. Large greenfield developments on the outskirts of a valley town, which is where you propose the vast bulk of future housing in Berkhamsted will be built, is going to force car usage over all other forms of transport. People hardly use buses, cycles or walking at all from the existing houses along Shootersway into the town centre. It's too far to walk, too steep to cycle and too ill served by public transport for any kind of bus usage to be practical. The people who currently live along that route overwhelmingly drive into the town centre. Another huge swathe of houses from Hall Park to Grims Ditch like you propose will only make the problem ten times worse. You can produce all the pie in the sky transport studies you like but everyone who lives in South Berkhamsted knows that's the truth. Furthermore building over so much green belt land to the south of Berkhamsted, much of which is currently wooded, will hardly ' increase the area of habitats that fix and store carbon, including tree planting' that the council states is one of its aims in all this.

My final and in many ways most important objection is that this is the wrong time to be making plans for the next twenty years. Covid and Brexit have turned our world on it head. Massive technological and societal changes brought on by Covid are going to change towns forever. Amazon is killing retail spaces and companies like Arcadia. Deliveroo is killing

restaurants and companies like Cafe Rouge. Home working is killing offices and Netflix is killing cinema. In the face of all this you want to make changes for the next twenty years when the whole world's focus is on getting out of Covid in one piece. I'm sorry, but this is wilfully anti democratic, it really feels like you are trying to 'bury bad news'. This whole exercise needs to be delayed at least until people are back at work and at school and thus able to focus on something with such far reaching consequences for the beautiful town we all love.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6815

**Person ID** 1265036

**Full Name** Tom Burrows

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6831

**Person ID** 1265031

**Full Name** Melissa Hansraj

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.111 The replacement location for playing pitches on Haslam Fields, isn't walkable from Berkhamsted, as it is too dangerous. This will result in more traffic on the Roads, creating further air pollution and congestion.</p> <p>23.112 Where is the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Scheme?? This needs to be made available for comments prior to the Draft Plan being accepted.</p> <p>The view from Northchurch (North) of the green sided valley to the south will be lost with development of BK06. This is an outstanding view of a green hillside in the heart of the Chilterns and links with the distance views of the green valley to the west.</p> <p>Where will the new primary and secondary school be located. This needs to be linked to the transport plan and the location of new housing to reduce the number of car journeys.</p> <p>23.116 The new library is smaller than the old library and unfortunately, is a result of the old conservative council selling off property/land to balance the books, wth no thought to the local community. The entrance is at a very busy junction and is dangerous for parents with young children to exit.</p> <p>23.117 The new proposed retail foodstore is too far from the proposed new housing plots. This will cause more congestion from car journeys along the High Street. This will increase the air pollution at this junction with Billet Lane and reduce the safety of our children walking to school.</p> <p>23.121 The on and off-site measures need to specified now before the plan is accepted. As you say many of the sites are on "edge of town" locations and therefore will make it difficult for new residents to connect with the town without using a car. This will increase congestion, air pollution and decrease the safety of our children walking to school.</p> <p>23.122 Where is the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy? The plan cannot be accepted without allowing it to be reviewed by local residents.</p> <p>23.125 The location of the new primary and secondary school needs to be agreed as this will affect the transport plan, particularly if parents need to drop off and colect children from school.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6863

<b>Person ID</b>	1265056
<b>Full Name</b>	John Hitchcox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It's very clear that the current plans would add to already congested roads, increase pollution levels, put pressure on water supplies and wastewater systems and vastly increase surface run-off in an area already prone to flooding.</p> <p>The infrastructure needed is also not in place – where will all of these extra children go to secondary school? There is just one state secondary school in Berkhamsted, which is already at capacity. There is no provision for this in the plan.</p> <p>There also seems to be no consideration of how important green space is to existing residents and biodiversity in the area. Building on green areas removes the very reason people have chosen to live here.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6870
<b>Person ID</b>	1263500
<b>Full Name</b>	Jessica Haigh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The</p>



Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6873

**Person ID** 1261827

**Full Name** Ian Brener

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** This is an awful way of getting a response from ordinary citizens. The document is over long and unreadable. It is ridiculous and irresponsible that this is happening during such an unprecedented crisis for our country. I can't believe that this is legitimate.

I endorse the response from the CCG

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6883

**Person ID** 1265006

**Full Name** Tracy Bownes

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed population growth is excessive for a market town.</p> <p>The destruction of greenbelt is not in line with national planning guidelines requiring "exceptional circumstances."</p> <p>All of the proposed sites are likely to require car transportation to the station, creating further town centre congestion.</p> <p>The proposal identifies there is inadequate infrastructure certainty (especially education) for Berkhamsted West proposals.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted South proposals provide no additional secondary education facilities. The impact of the additional homes on Ashlyns ability to provide in town places to all of Berkhamsted's secondary school children will be compromised unless there is increased provision. It would appear that the plan places "hope" on a site being found in West Berkhamsted to alleviate this pressure, but the south Berkhamsted proposals should not be accepted until overall in-town provision is resolved.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6957
<b>Person ID</b>	1265059
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Austin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The plans for berkhamsted involve building on open areas of green belt land. While largely infill sites the identified sites such have south berkhamsted have led to further developer proposals to connect berkhamsted with bourne end, and no doubt beyond in the future. This urban sprawl is precisely what the green belt was introduced to prevent, and thus is being ignored.</p> <p>government policy that has led to the Dacorum plan has been challenged and planning guidance reconsidered. Housing and schools does nothing for the town other than to place increased pressure on the existing infrastructure that can never be addressed due to the market town layout, dictated by its valley location.</p> <p>the plan should consider what berkhamsted wants and needs, rather than seeking to justify a prescribed level of new housing across the borough.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6967
<b>Person ID</b>	1265081
<b>Full Name</b>	Caitlin Neale
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Flawed windfall calculations, projection (based on flawed models and data) and the lack of a national strategy that takes into consideration long term regional development rebalance leads to a faulty delivery strategy. It appears to be prioritising building on greenbelt over and above Hemel brownbelt. The suggest that decision have been biased by developer influence, supporting development in areas with higher premiums, which makes the commitment to 40% affordable housing (in areas with 10+homes being built) seem naive.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7009
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7067
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7086
<b>Person ID</b>	1264453
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Hinton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Myself
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264426
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Fiona Hinton
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Miscalculations in requirements, windfall allocations and projections seem to have led to a reliance on plans to build on Green Belt areas. The emphasis on these areas of Berkhamsted lead to the questions that this proposal is tailored to developers rather than the communities of the future. The fact that existing infrastructure issues, such as transport links within the town to reduce congestion and pollution, have not already been addressed rings alarm bells that these will be unlikely to be adequately addressed if this proposal is approved.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7130
<b>Person ID</b>	1262099
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Taylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer-led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist. I strenuously object.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7144
<b>Person ID</b>	1265074
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Wilson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The town is already very crowded. The size of developments would add to congestion at its centre.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7211
<b>Person ID</b>	1265129
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Foxwell-Moss
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist as per my previous comments.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7256
<b>Person ID</b>	1264956
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Heard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7258
<b>Person ID</b>	1264940
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Naylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Reading through some of the documents, I have the impression that it has already been decided that the A41 should form the new boundary of Green Belt around Berkhamsted, presumably as the planners feel it is an easy option. Although I do not live adjacent to the South Berkhamsted growth area, I don't live far away and now that I am working from home due to the pandemic, I walk up there most days. I meet scores of other residents, old and young, walking the paths through the fields and woodland - during this strange time, people have made full use of this countryside that is so close to our town. I have been wondering lately how many of those people realise that this land is about to be declassified as Green Belt, and that their daily walk is on the brink of being signed away without any kind of public discussion, only a consultation accessible by an overwhelming online process. This is why I strongly feel that we must pause this process until the plan can be discussed and debated in our town, with those who are not so comfortable with the internet given an opportunity to have their voices heard. This process is just not inclusive enough to discuss such a huge change.

I also would like more details of how the services will cope with these large new estates in the south Berkhamsted area. We don't have enough GP coverage of the area as it is, the roads leading up to this plot of land are not designed to carry hundreds of extra cars, and often after heavy rain, sewerage starts appearing out of the storm drains on the main road - and that's only with the houses that already exist on this side of the valley. Will new services be provided *before* the developers move in? The borough freely admits that they do not organise such things, they can only encourage them - the developers will be only too keen to build lots of lucrative housing here where asking prices are so high, will they be so keen to provide us all with better drains?

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7303

**Person ID** 358532

**Full Name** Ms Gillian Culham

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Car park in lower kings road – Berkhamsted.  
 Public amenities need to be provided

P225

The congestion at Durrants Lane only came about with the introduction of the traffic lights. If the first roundabout had been put at the bottom of Durrants lane and not to the side as it was, the flow of traffic would have improved, and now would still be flowing much better.

Policy SP20 (THIS WONDERFUL DESCRIPTION)

Hem3. You state “beautifully and imaginatively designed homes and want health communities”, then you need to also provide internal SPACE for their health otherwise it’s like having a new pair of shoes but they don’t fit!! Ouch



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7309
<b>Person ID</b>	1265181
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW WOODFORD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I want to object to the proposed new homes in our local area (Dacorum) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property numbers really concerns me the most. The 16,899 homes is a disproportionate increase considering the Governments projected population growth statistics. This is an unreasonable and unnecessary burden to undertake for our locality.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposed housing in our neighbouring towns of Tring and Berkhamsted, in addition to the 400 houses in Northchurch, will cause traffic congestion especially on our High Street. That's not discounting the obvious increased pollution and hazard this poses our children especially with our school placed right bang centre of the village with poor side-walks and access.</li> <li>• Northchurch is a village and is therefore very connected to its beautiful local countryside. Building on Green belt here and in Dacorum is unlawful as it has not been proven to be necessary. Within minutes of my home I can walk into lovely countryside and enjoy the peace and fresh air it provides, as well as the nature that inhabits it. You can not undervalue its importance for our physical and mental well being which to be honest has been highlighted in this Pandemic</li> <li>• I really worries me that we would lose our community and village identity as we meld into Berkhamsted. We are proud and see ourselves apart from Berkhamsted and wish to keep it this way. I've read mention of our village as 'West Berkhamsted' and this upsets me as we have lovely tree lined roads a plenty, drives for our cars to park on and our own real sense of identity quite different to Berkhamsted.</li> </ul> <p>Please see the bigger picture and realise how unreasonable your current proposal is.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7325
<b>Person ID</b>	1265327
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE MACDONALD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>To whom it may concern I am writing to express by concern and objection to the proposals detailed in the Dacorum Borough Council Emerging Strategy for Growth.</p> <p>I am concerned about the impact on the environment, traffic congestion and the infrastructure not to mention the loss of green belt. The road that I live on is extremely busy at all times of day, it can take my child a few minutes to be able to cross the road due to constant traffic. In the morning it can take 20 minutes to get out of or into Berkhamsted due to the level of traffic. Berkhamsted was built at a time and with road networks that are not able to absorb the amount of vehicular traffic. Further increasing housing will only exacerbate this issue.</p> <p>Other areas of concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on and loss of green belt land and areas of natural outstanding beauty</li> <li>• Over provision of housing</li> <li>• Failure to address climate issues</li> <li>• Impact on infrastructure which is creaking at the seams</li> <li>• impact on water supply and waste disposal</li> <li>• Lack of brownfield regeneration proposals - why is this not the priority</li> <li>• Over-reliance on growth strategies and partnership which have not been subject to public consultation and scrutiny</li> <li>• The plan is at odds with the recent government desire to address the imbalance of investment between the north and south.</li> </ul> <p>I object to these plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7351
<b>Person ID</b>	1265336
<b>Full Name</b>	SARA SADIQ-ALI
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the development on green belt land in Northchurch. You will decrease the quality of life significantly for all current residents and visitors. We live in a beautiful area with green belt land that has been deemed green belt for a reason. Green belt land should only be built upon if 100% necessary and we have not reached that point -there are other places in the country to build and the real statistics do not back this decision. If we build here we run the risk of climate change impacts, damage to environment and wildlife, as well as the wellbeing of our community. We choose to live in a place with open space to walk, have wildlife/pets and gain exercise in fresh air. We pay/have paid/continue to pay a premium to live here, but the development would reduce that quality of life without giving us back that premium.</p> <p>The huge number of houses proposed - 16899 simply is not justified by the latest statistics on population growth. We are already experiencing issues of over capacity across Northchurch, Berkhamsted &amp; Tring where we have gridlock traffic, lack of parking, very busy high streets, pressure on schools, doctors surgeries etc. If we add these houses, and specifically 400 in Northchurch we will have a great impact on these factors again decreasing quality of life which is what we all pay to live here for. There has been great community spirit in COVID times here where neighbours support each other and the community and the over-filling of our local area will diminish this as we will not be able to accomodate the numbers with the infrastructure and space that we have and building that infrastructure only adds even more invasion on the little free space that would be left after the housing was up. You can already see that doctors across towns are linking to be able to serve the community due to increasing capacity, pressure on supermarkets is high, schools districts are tight and options limited due to demand. We have reached capacity in order to maintain physical and mental wellbeing of the community, and to grow housing more here will directly lead to decline in both of these.</p> <p>Northchurch is a beautiful, valued community and this development will cause irreversible damage.</p>

I therefore wholeheartedly object to the building of these 16899 houses overall, and even more specifically as a resident in Northchurch the 400 here.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7356

**Person ID** 1265355

**Full Name** WILLIAM GOSS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I wish to record my objections to the planning proposals in the Berkhamsted and Northchurch area. The area is already congested in traffic and air pollution. Schools,Hospital are already have difficulty in coping. We were told that a relief road would be built through the Chiltern Park development to ease the use of the canal bridge.which is totally inadequate to today's volumes of Traffic.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7360

**Person ID** 1145088

**Full Name** Mr Paul Andrews

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I'm writing to express my views and objections to the Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038). Having studied the plans, and as a resident of Berkhamsted, can say that the plans for the town are objectionable for the reasons outlined in the statement below.

My first objection is on the basis of ecological and climate grounds. The developments proposed around the south of Berkhamsted will destroy vast amounts of Green Belt. **The Council appears to have failed to take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints; including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB.** This is land that once built on will never be returned to a natural state - something that we can ill afford as we struggle against the changes in our climate. Any plan that is made to provide new housing must guarantee the protection of existing natural habits and creation of new ones. **The current plans do not do this.**

In addition, this area of Green Belt provides a degree of protection to the town by absorbing pollution from the A41. Beyond this, it provides health benefits to the population by providing natural environments to exercise in - something which has proven essential throughout 2020. The proposed area of development to the south east of Berkhamsted is also productively farmed, another reason why this area should not be considered for property development.

**Developing on Green Belt is also in contradiction to national Government policy and as a result the Dacorum plan should be reconsidered to look for alternatives on existing Brownfield sites.** There are already many sites that can be considered across the borough, and the likely changing nature of commercial property use in the coming years, increased by changing behaviours post-Covid will afford more.

**My second reason for objection is the lack of planning or detail which has been considered for the infrastructure of the town and the burden these new houses will place on it.** The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed. The proposals do not include suitable provision for affordable housing, something which is already a problem in this part of the borough.

**In addition there are already poor public transport links within the town, and the proposals do nothing to improve them.** Connected to this objection are my concerns regarding the use that existing roads will suffer. Many of the connecting roads between the valley (A4251) and the new houses and the A41 will become busy rat-runs, raising pollution levels and introducing more road-safety risks in residential areas. Swing Gate Lane is a perfect example of a problem that these proposals will create. That road will become a rat-run connecting route to the A41, avoiding the town centre. It currently runs past 2 schools and a play area, and is already over-parked. **These plans as I've interpreted them do not improve the safety or environment of the rest of the town.**

Beyond these specific reasons for objection to the proposals, **I also question the basis on which they have all been made.** The national government guidance has been inconsistent in the past 6 months, which is enough reason to re-assess the requirements for housing growth across the borough. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them.

By your own admission in the Plan there are "uncertainties over using this as our housing figure" **Any proposal of such significance for the Borough should not be made on uncertain estimates or assumptions.**

You further admit "further refinement to the process of calculating housing need" is required, **and I urge you to do this before progressing any further.**

Finally, I raise a concern regarding the way the consultation has been organised and the information made available to residents. Covid restrictions have prevented this information being available in suitable public spaces, and an extension for accepting comments of one month during lockdown restrictions is inadequate. Plans with such wide ranging impacts on a borough should be made available to all residents of the borough for due consideration.

The online means of displaying the proposal documents is also not fit for purpose. Creating a 'virtual physical space' to browse documents is an incredibly poor and impenetrable user experience. Making information easily available in a web-browser, with better indexed and searchable information is a far more appropriate means of displaying vital information. I worry about the decision making that has gone on to spend time on this 'fake' physical display when better provision of information should have been considered.

I trust that these objections will be duly noted and considered with all the other objections that I expect you to receive from across the borough. I urge you to reconsider the plans you're making with consideration of all the above points.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7361
<b>Person ID</b>	1265357

<b>Full Name</b>	Jan Dent
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted to register my objection to the DBC Local Plan on the following grounds:</p> <p><b>Housing numbers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is using outdated (2014) housing projections. Half of this number (or fewer) are needed in reality. The whole Local Plan should be based on the more up-to-date ONS data from 2018. DBC must challenge the proposed housing numbers rather than just accept them. This is a fundamental error and will render any planning actions based on this flawed plan highly vulnerable to judicial review. In view of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic, the number of planned homes needs to be urgently re-assessed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure &amp; sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport study takes no account of Berkhamsted's geography and <u>valley</u>. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley. The residents of these houses will need to access the town and, owing to the steep hills involved, will by-and-large use their cars, exacerbating existing traffic congestion and parking problems</li> <li>There are no significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shooters Way, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion and pollution.</li> <li>There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted's traffic situation, which is already excessive.</li> <li>Residents from the new housing needing to access the north side of the town and beyond will increase the flow over roads that are already blighted by volumes, speeding and pollution. Gravel Path and New Road suffer from choke points over the canal or under the railway or both, creating knock-on congestion back into the town.</li> <li>No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes. These are essential given the steep hills between the majority of the new housing and the town</li> <li>No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)</li> <li>The 'wildlife corridors' are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don't connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)</li> <li>No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.</li> </ul>

- The nearest hospitals are already operating beyond their capacities, and there is no provision for increasing their capacity to cope with the increased numbers of residents planned. Also, an ageing population is going to need more accessible healthcare resources.
- The Plan claims that 2 primary schools and a secondary school will be built in Berkhamsted. It does not set out who will do this and how it will be funded.

### **Water**

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It's not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested. Again, any planning actions based on this flawed plan will be highly vulnerable to judicial review.

### **Employment Strategy**

- The Plan needs to be recast in the light of the major shifts in working and living habits accelerated by the Covid crisis. Working from home will significantly reduce the need for office space. In the Employment Strategy 8.10 additional office space of 188,000 square meters will need to be revised down, avoiding the need to encroach on Green Belt (8.18)
- The town of Berkhamsted is already overwhelmed by traffic and under-provided with parking. Several businesses have already left the town for these reasons.

### **Greenbelt**

- Nearly all development proposed will be on Green Belt. – this is *against* Government policy.
- The land between Shooters Way and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. *A green buffer is needed.* If this land is built upon, the already poor air quality on the south side of the town (and in the valley) will be considerably degraded beyond legal limits. There is no up-to-date consideration for this issue in the Plan
- DBC should look at further Brownfield sites – as it is required to do.

### **Pollution**

- Last but not least...Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Traffic already regularly breaks the 20 mph speed limit in Berkhamsted with impunity, creating pedestrian danger and damaging air quality for the many schools that lie on, or close to, the A4251 that runs through Berkhamsted and Northchurch



- Drivers on Gravel Path consistently exceed the 30 mph speed limit. This road is not safe for pedestrians and cyclists as a result.
- : **23.75 "a sustainable movement corridor linking Leighton Buzzard Road in the west to Redbourn Road to the east" :**

If the A4146 Leighton Buzzard Road is the main N/S link between Hemel and Leighton Buzzard, then I assume traffic will increase along this road particularly with the increase in the number of residents as a result of the proposed housing development in Hemel. In peak periods this road is already difficult to join from the side roads and safer traffic measures will need to be introduced.

With the likely increase of traffic using the A4146, I wish to register concern about the potential increase of traffic using Gravel Path in Berkhamsted as drivers seek to travel E/W through Potten End and Berkhamsted and to make their way to Berkhamsted train station. This route is unsuitable for a significant increase in the number and speed of cars and re-routing should be considered to encourage drivers to stick to alternative main routes.

For example, access to / from Berkhamsted, and in particular to the train station, from the east is better directed along New Road, rather than Gravel Path, since New Road is wider, not so winding and dangerous and not residential.

The Safer Gravel Path Action Group is already active in trying to reduce the speed of cars using Gravel Path and the number of accidents involving the railway bridge and vehicles at the crossroads with Station Road / Ravens Lane / Ellesmere Road are proof to the unsuitability of this road for anything other than local traffic.

- Berkhamsted lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area. The proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.
- DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. *Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.*

#### Included files

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7363

**Person ID** 1265360

**Full Name** DAVID STORR

#### Organisation Details

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm writing with response to the proposed housing development in Northchurch, Berkhamsted.</p> <p>There are too many new houses proposed overall. It will significantly change the area, reducing the valuable green space.</p> <p>The proposed developments across the valley should be sufficient growth for the town.</p> <p>There is not enough proof of the need to build on the Green Belt areas. Green Belt areas are called that for a reason. They should be preserved to provide space for recreation, and mental &amp; physical wellbeing. Climate change is also a massive factor in maintaining Green belt.</p> <p>More building would create road traffic congestion. The current infrastructure is currently at capacity. Adding more traffic to the road system will result in more congestion &amp; pollution.</p> <p>A link road between Springfield Road &amp; B4506 would create a rat run that would negatively impact the residents in the area. Herds of deer currently frequent this area and would be displaced by a link road.</p> <p>I've struggled to find time to write this due to juggling work and childcare over lockdown.</p> <p>Please reconsider the plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7369
<b>Person ID</b>	1265362
<b>Full Name</b>	ROSEMARY NORTH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am responding by email as I your website is not allowing me to submit comments.

Whilst I realise that there is a great need in Dacorum for affordable housing, the projected sites for housing in both Berkhamsted and Tring are well away from the town centres, which will necessitate travel by car. There is already a lack of adequate parking spaces in both towns.

Why is there a proposal to put a new supermarket on the Dunsley Farm site when there is a large Tesco opposite? Another supermarket should be located to the east of Tring where new housing is proposed. However, putting housing in that area will significantly detract from the current rural views in an area of AONB. Brownfield sites should be used instead of cutting into the Green Belt, which should only be touched in exceptional circumstances.

The plan does not clearly explain in what ways Dacorum Council will mitigate Green Belt loss and meet the County's goals for climate change and carbon reduction. Where will car charging points be located? Currently there are only a few located in car parks in Berkhamsted.

Only one new school is proposed for Berkhamsted, on the west side of the town. However, on the south side there are major housing development proposals and Swing gate School and Thomas Coram School are both currently full.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7382

**Person ID** 406535

**Full Name** Mr Peter Hepburn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Re development in Berkhamsted it is nothing short of shocking the amount of new buildings planned. The extent of the expansion will change the nature of the town . I guess this is special pleading but the planners are making a huge mistake given the current infrastructure issues already apparent on Shootersway.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7383
<b>Person ID</b>	1265371
<b>Full Name</b>	David and Charlotte Vesey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We have read and agree with the response made by the Berkhamsted Citizens Association to the draft reg 18 plan and thus object to this plan.</p> <p>As Berkhamsted residents our principal concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 We do not think that necessary infrastructure will in practice be able to be built to service the proposed increase of dwellings. Current legislation, economics and the particular geography of Berkhamsted do not seem capable of achieving this.</li> <li>1 The plan appears to be based on earlier predictions of population growth which are roughly twice what is now expected. The effects of Brexit, Covid and a shift of Government emphasis to the North of England should be considered.</li> <li>1 Expanding the town will lead to further congestion as people in outlying parts will need to drive into the town centre. Even electric vehicles have a significant environmental impact when “cradle to grave” issues are taken into consideration.</li> </ol>

1 Covid has highlighted the need for towns and cities to have green areas for the physical and mental well-being of citizens and thus the vital importance of preserving green belts. The plan shows green belt areas removed for development.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7389

**Person ID** 1265373

**Full Name** ANDREW FAIRBROTHER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I wish to make an objection to the proposed building of 2,700 homes on green belt land around Berkhamsted that was in the news recently.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7391

**Person ID** 494038

**Full Name** Mr Stephen Lally

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object to the present Dacorum Local Plan and the way it has been arrived at.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This high number of houses in Berkhamsted is not needed. New residents in them will have to commute to work and will find it difficult to shop in Berkhamsted town centre (access and parking) and so will commute to shop too.</li> <li>• There is not enough thought given to quality of housing environment (open spaces, trees).</li> <li>• Not enough thought has been given to the existing problems of infrastructure in Berkhamsted (Schools, doctors, drains, congestion and struggling up the hill to the new sites).</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7478
<b>Person ID</b>	1265550
<b>Full Name</b>	DAN BLANEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm a Berkhamsted resident, I've lived in Dacorum my whole life and was born in Hemel Hempstead. I've seen much change over that time but I'm shocked by the scale of development being proposed in this Plan.</p> <p>I understand the need for housing, including affordable housing, but as far as I can see from the Plan, it is suggesting at least 2,200 new homes in Berkhamsted. That seems excessive, how has that number been arrived at?</p> <p>We live in a town that lies within a valley. That already sees traffic in town tailing back along the high street, and "rat runs" in parallel roads and routes down either side of the valley. The number of homes being suggested is going to significantly worsen that and see a big increase in vehicle traffic in what is already a constrained space. I can't see in the Plan any significant provision for improvements to traffic flowing around the town, or new roads to change that. And it doesn't seem to have taken consideration of the town's geography. Has this been considered in the Plan?</p> <p>We live in a wonderful place, and I'm proud to live in this town. I simply don't understand the logic in flooding it with housing, more cars and congestion. It goes counter to what makes the town what it is, and what makes it special as a market town.</p> <p>I'm also surprised to see the locations selected, with much of the development proposed on greenbelt. How has that decision been arrived at? This land is essential for that reason - as a greenbelt or buffer to protect from over development.</p>

This is a huge amount of development and will have a significantly detrimental impact on our community and the environment as a result.

This Local Plan is going to change our town for the worse. It will leave us with a more congested, less sustainable, and polluted town, and put a severe strain on the infrastructure that supports it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7481

**Person ID** 399397

**Full Name** Mrs Andrea McPherson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7482

**Person ID** 226124

**Full Name** Mr Nicholas Heath

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Moving onto the proposals themselves, my specific concerns fall into two categories, namely infrastructure and environment.</p> <p>In terms of infrastructure, specifically as regards Berkhamsted (although some comments may apply equally to other centres, such as Tring), it is apparent that the existing infrastructure is already under very significant pressure. In particular I would observe the following:</p> <p>1). Congestion, Traffic and Parking.  The geography of the town, being a linear layout within and along a valley, means that the vast majority of through-traffic, and many local journeys, are directly along the High Street, leading to significant congestion throughout much of the day the during the week and on Saturdays. There are few alternative routes through the town, and where these exist (Bridgewater Road and Shootersway) they are through residential areas. The congestion extends to other parts of the town centre, particularly between Lower Kings Road and the Station, with the central High Street crossroads and traffic lights being the focus of frequent significant delays. Parking for town centre staff, shoppers, visitors and commuters is at a premium and already, at current population levels, leads to congested kerbsides throughout much of the town centre area.</p> <p>2). Public Transport.  There is already (pre-pandemic) very significant pressure on train capacity, particularly at peak times into and out of central London.</p> <p>3). Water Supply and Sewerage.  Some of these limitations are observed during sewerage flooding incidents close to the Old Mill and Hall Park areas of the town, and I am told that these services are already at or beyond capacity across much of the town. Experience suggests that, even where such services are capable of upgrade and extension, there tends to be a partial enduring reliance on existing systems and pipework, and that seldom is sufficient finance made available for suitable upgrades in a timely manner ahead of new building developments.</p> <p>4). Health and Education.  There is already significant pressure on local primary healthcare, with GP appointments being heavily oversubscribed, and certain services restricted (eg blood tests being referred to Hemel Hempstead), with consequent increased costs and time for users, and greater environmental impact. Education provision, particularly at secondary level is already becoming stretched, and whilst new schools form part of the Local Plan proposals these take further green space and tend to follow significantly behind new residential development.</p> <p>5). Employment.  There is limited scope in the Local Plan proposals for additional employment opportunities within the town. The implication of this is that any new housing will serve merely as dormitory accommodation for commuters, particularly into central London, adding to the congestion pressures on the roads and on the train service, as covered above.</p>



Secondly, in terms of environment, my comments are:

1). Amenity

Many of the proposed areas for potential residential development are on the fringes of the town that form the immediate natural environment to the everyday lives of local residents. These areas are served by numerous lanes, towpaths, footpaths and common areas that are enjoyed by residents for walking, jogging, cycling, etc. Development of the proposed sites compromises many of these routes and marginalises their amenity value. The effect of these losses would be for increased transport movements, particularly cars, as residents drive further out of the town in search of recreational opportunities, further exacerbating congestion and adding to pollution. The need for the local outdoors has been heightened by increasing home working during the pandemic, and by the denial of indoor exercise and team sports due to the pandemic restrictions. A positive side to this trend appears to be the greater awareness, and participation of activities, in the local countryside, with benefits to physical health and personal wellbeing. These positive trends should be encouraged and developed.

2). Agriculture.

At a time when the UK is finding a new individual path in trading arrangements with its European neighbours, the provision of good agricultural land close to markets is of increased importance in meeting the demand for food and in limiting travel distances for produce. Losing agricultural land to new residential development would be a retrograde step in this regard.

3). Wildlife.

As a regular walker across many of the proposed development sites, I have observed much wildlife currently flourishing in the pockets of woodland, and in the hedgerows and fields that are earmarked for development. There are many birds, insects and small mammals that would come under threat from new buildings and human activity, however well and sustainable these are planned.

4). Environment.

Perhaps the most critical aspect of the whole Consultation focusses around the loss of green space. The area around Berkhamsted is part of an Area of Outstanding National Beauty within the Chilterns. Many of the sites are within the Green Belt around London, forming the first extensive open space experienced on leaving the capital, and the last countryside when entering. The proposal for the developments along the south side of Berkhamsted are particularly unfortunate in this regard, as they align along a ridge top above the Bulbourne Valley that is visible across much of the Borough from Hemel Hempstead, Boxmoor and Berkhamsted itself. These areas should be avoided for development at all costs in terms of new residential building on account of their conspicuous location.

5). Ambiance and Legacy.

Berkhamsted is a historic market town with a unique character that should be cherished for future generations. The setting and approaches to the town are important and should be protected for our own wellbeing and also for the benefit of our descendants.

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7508
<b>Person ID</b>	1265570
<b>Full Name</b>	BENJAMIN HARTE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to register my objection and deep concern over the current plans for building on Greenbelt land in and around Northchurch and Berkhamsted.</p> <p>These plans will have a significant and detrimental impact on the quality of life of existing residents, to say nothing of the environmental damage and pollution such action would result in.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7525
<b>Person ID</b>	1265579
<b>Full Name</b>	ANNE MCCLEAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am objecting to what I view as excessive, unnecessary house building in Berkhamsted, which is destroying the environment.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7526
<b>Person ID</b>	1265581
<b>Full Name</b>	ASHLEY TICKELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Fundamentally changes the town of Berkhamsted due to the sheer quantity and density of housing volumes proposed. This volume is based on an algorithm now known to be flawed and cannot be used.</p> <p>Affordable provision for local people is wholly inadequate at 7.5% volume share per 1,000 homes built. This when the DCB council waiting list currently has in excess of 7,000 people on it.</p> <p>The A41 slip roads between Aylesbury and the M25 junction 20 are wholly inadequate to accommodate the increase in road traffic making joining the A41 even more dangerous than it already is.</p> <p>Complete failure to protect the historic town of Berkhamsted and building residential properties only with no provision for additional services for health, leisure, education and amenity. A cheap New Town in effect with none of the responsibilities and provisions required for such an increased scale of development relative to the existing Town population and boundaries where provision for current residents is lacking.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7528
<b>Person ID</b>	482748
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Ian Rennie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this e-mail as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG,s responses under my name .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7531
<b>Person ID</b>	1265585
<b>Full Name</b>	COLIN STEWART
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7537

**Person ID** 1265587

**Full Name** Mr Arthur Gill

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

To whom it may concern on the planning committee,  
Having read the latest DBC development plan I wish to register my wholehearted rejection of the said proposal.  
Being a resident of Berkhamsted for over 40 years I have got to know the town very well and watched as additional small developments have been inserted and added to it, some acceptable and some not so. I have seen how all these developments have impacted on the functionality of the town and its' residents which have mostly been to its' detriment. The proposals outlined in the new development plan will be the death knell for Berkhamsted and Northchurch and make the towns unliveable and unsustainable as very eloquently spelt out in the responses submitted by the Berkhamsted Citizens Association and the Council for the Protection of Rural England.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7541

**Person ID** 1265592

**Full Name** Pat & Bernadette Hansberry

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>During our 10 years living in Berkhamsted, my wife and I have taken great interest in the development of the town and particularly how it has grown to meet the housing needs within the borough. Therefore, we would like to record our views regarding the proposals contained within the "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)" which we understand is designed to set out DBC's approach to accommodating further growth across the borough, outlining which sites are proposed for development and the policies that will cover the delivery of these developments and other developments within Dacorum.</p> <p>We would like to register the strongest objection to the choice of several of the development sites that are contained within the Plan given that I live in Berkhamsted, the prime objection is to the proposed developments within the Berkhamsted area.</p> <p>Our objections are made upon three fundamental strategic grounds that I/we have set out below:</p> <p>2. Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision. Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, we have serious concerns regarding the sheer scale of proposed development in Dacorum. The Council appears to have failed to take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6 which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and AONB. Indeed, recent Government guidance on calculating housing need has been, at best, confusing. The algorithm method for calculating housing need which has been used by the Council is not the correct means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough. The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them. We would remind the Council that on Wednesday 16 December the government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government also said:</p> <p>o "More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." and they went on to say "Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be</p>

planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."

3. Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land. The Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". However, it is evident that in meeting the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the "over-inflated" housing need, the Council proposes that, as a necessity, development must, therefore, take place on Green Belt land or land that is specially designated for other purposes. 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; these are prime reasons that my wife and I have chosen to live in this area. We remind the Council of the stance of our local Member of Parliament, Gagan Mohindra, on Green Belt land, which was included in an email response to me dated 17 November 2020. This appears to set out the Council's duty to plan for housing provision and protect our Green Belt and specially designated land:

o "I stood on a platform of protecting the Green Belt and will continue to fight that battle on a national level. I have previously written to Minister Rt Hon Chris Pincher at MHCLG about my concerns. At a local level, we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents. The only way to do this is through Dacorum Borough Council finalising its Local Plan as soon as possible".

4. Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure. Specifically, my wife and I have looked at the proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted and state categorically that there is insufficient consideration in the Plan for the provision of new or of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments. Berkhamsted is already a Town which is at capacity in terms of schooling, road services, water supply and wastewater disposal.

We trust our objection will be taken fully into account and am sure that you will see many more similar objections from other residents of Berkhamsted that the proposed developments within the town are wrongly premised, should not take place on Green Belt land and do not make proper provision for improved infrastructure for the town to accommodate such large developments.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7552

**Person ID** 1261671

**Full Name** Ms Maria Mandry

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I want to log that we strongly object to the south berkhamsted concept.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7553
<b>Person ID</b>	1149236
<b>Full Name</b>	Lindsay Stillwell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to convey my strong disagreement with the proposed growth of housing in Berkhamsted, much of which is located in sensitive ridge top locations in Green Belt.</p> <p>Importantly, these precious Green Spaces are enjoyed recreationally by local residents, enhancing both their physical and mental health.</p> <p>The Government has said Green Belt should be afforded the highest protection.</p> <p>In the light of the current pandemic (Covid 19) Berkhamsted Housing needs should be reassessed. It is likely that numerous businesses within the town will fail, which will release premises that could be converted into housing.</p> <p>The proposed growth of housing would over tax our congested Town Centre, the towns water and sewage capacity, Medical and Social care services, whilst more cars would increase an already congested town centre.</p> <p>Significantly fewer houses should be built and those that are should be on brownfield sites.</p> <p>Will you kindly note my disagreement with Draft Reg 18 Local Plan 2020</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7557



<b>Person ID</b>	1163966
<b>Full Name</b>	Philippa Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Berkhamsted and am appalled by the plans to develop the countryside here which is within the Green Belt. It has always been a policy to maintain rural areas for the use of farmers, walkers and young people who need to understand the importance of natural land. Most of the land around Berkhamsted is within the Green Belt and should not under any circumstances be given over to development.</p> <p>Without the Green Belt there would be catastrophic death of wild animals and farmers' crops. It is unconscionable to urbanise the beautiful Hertfordshire countryside, and its refuge for wild animals. There should be no house-building in these areas given the need to maintain the Green Belt and natural woodlands.</p> <p>A key function of the Green Belt is to absorb the rain fall so that flooding is more controllable. With the hard surfaces that building will bring, there could easily be widespread flooding as a consequence.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7564
<b>Person ID</b>	1265605
<b>Full Name</b>	Carolyn Dunmur
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7565
<b>Person ID</b>	1265606
<b>Full Name</b>	Prof. Jonathan Morris
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like take the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the new Local plan specifically as it affects Berkhamsted and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>There are three aspects of the plan that I find extremely worrying to the point that I have to say that I doubt that this consultation would stand up to an audit at law.</p> <p>Firstly, the consultation process itself has been conducted during the pandemic and with no physical displays or meetings. There are many people in Berkhamsted who will have been unable to respond to the plan as a result. Many residents, particularly the elderly, do not have access to the internet, so will have been unable to either investigate the documentation, nor submit an electronic response. Furthermore, during the course of the pandemic many residents will have been minimising any journeys made into public centres etc, including a large number of shielders. In short, this consultation fails the tests of the application of the Equalities Act of 2010 as it does not allow all citizens equal opportunity to comment upon it and have those comments taken into consideration: it is directly discriminatory against those residents who, primarily as a result of the protected characteristics of age and disability, will have been prevented from taking part. It is notable in this regard that similar consultations in other areas have been postponed until post-pandemic, raising the suspicion that the Borough does not intend to promote an equal and open consultation, and has deliberately taken steps to avoid doing so.</p>

Second the consultation is fundamentally flawed in terms of the data upon which it relies. It is based on ONS data from 2014 as opposed to 2018. The 2018 data projects a future housing need that is literally half that of 2014. It seems incredible that the Borough is relying on old data to impose far greater strain upon itself to provide housing with all that this involves, when simply updating its data would remove this. In my role as a university professor, I would severely mark down any student who did not apply the latest data to a problem – and again I cannot anticipate that a legal review would allow such a short-cut to pass. Is the Borough simply too lazy to re-input the data? The huge resultant strain that using the outdated figures will create upon the already stretched infrastructure of the town beggars belief.

Finally, the net result of the proposed strategy for growth will be to destroy the principles upon which planning has always operated in this region, and in the South East as whole – that is to use green belt restrictions in order to avoid the creation of contiguous developments that erode the distinctions between historic settlements. The plan itself threatens to take this further – while the alternative Thackenhams proposal that is being widely canvassed by the developer to the public, would effectively amalgamate Berkhamsted with Bourne End to the detriment of both.

Please start using the 2018 data in a sensible manner and produce a new attenuated plan which could be properly consulted upon following the end of the pandemic, and preserve what is best about our borough while enabling it provide appropriate facilities for its citizens of the future.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7575

**Person ID** 1265613

**Full Name** JAMES CLARKE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7587
<b>Person ID</b>	1265616
<b>Full Name</b>	KELLY MCCLEAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7590
<b>Person ID</b>	1265617
<b>Full Name</b>	NICCI CORRADO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7592
<b>Person ID</b>	1144667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Frank Mayman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7594
<b>Person ID</b>	1265618

<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL WOODS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The houses proposed will encourage people to use cars as they are not near employment or transport hubs, and there is nothing in the plan to prove how the necessary transport links will be created.</p> <p>The increased populations in these proposed houses will mean more traffic travelling along Northchurch and Berkhamsted High Streets, leading to congestion, increased pollution, health problems, road safety concerns. This will be bad for the mental and physical health of our residents and future generations.</p> <p>The proposed plan refers to Northchurch as West Berkhamsted. This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7597
<b>Person ID</b>	1265619
<b>Full Name</b>	VICTORIA MITCHLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7598
<b>Person ID</b>	1150975
<b>Full Name</b>	MS GWEN ROBERTS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have read with dismay the plans for the huge number of houses to be built in and around the Berkhamsted area. This town has already suffered from the effects of the by-pass with large numbers of cars, lorries and vans being directed straight into the town centre with all the noise,pollution and general disruption to daily life that this has brought. The latest plans indicate many, many more houses to be built when our services, doctors, dentists and schools are over stretched, our beautiful green spaces are disappearing at an alarming rate and it would appear that we will become merely an extension of Hemel Hemstead.</p> <p>This used to be a delightful 'market town' which is being gradually downgraded and therefore losing its character. Towns like Berkhamsted are historic and are a valuable draw for visitors both from this country and abroad - they need to be preserved not become just another addition to the urban sprawl.</p>

Above all our precious surrounding countryside needs protecting from this 'care-less' attitude of dumping vast numbers of houses on every possible green space.

In addition, the proposed move of the local football pitch etc to the outskirts of the town (meaning more car use and consequent pollution) in order for development to take place is just a nonsense.

I object in the strongest way to the aspects of the Local Plan affecting this town and immediately surrounding area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7599

**Person ID** 1263003

**Full Name** jennifer jones

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents' Action Group(BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish Dacorum Borough Council to duplicate BRAG's response under my name.

Please do not sacrifice the protection of vital Green Belt and countryside for the benefit for future generations for short term financial gain. You have a responsibility to ensure the environment is the first consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7601



<b>Person ID</b>	1265736
<b>Full Name</b>	DARREN HOGG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7602
<b>Person ID</b>	1265737
<b>Full Name</b>	ADRIAN BARNETT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7605
<b>Person ID</b>	1265740
<b>Full Name</b>	GILLIAN BARNETT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7616
<b>Person ID</b>	224196
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jeremy Gosling
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wish to register my objections to the development proposed in the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038), specifically the site "Growth Area

Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted" but also to the large number of properties proposed on other sites to the south of Berkhamsted.

The sheer scale of the developments are staggering. Given the existing levels of congestion, poor air quality and lack of parking in the centre of the town, adding many hundreds of more cars journeys that will me made as a result of the proposed housing being far from amenities and the train station will surely make the situation worse.

This must also be counter to the Government's climate change commitments.

The proposed development and its link road to the A41 border two schools which will bring increased levels of noise and pollution.

Public Health England (PHE) 2019 review highlighted the need to reduce air pollution in the vicinity of schools saying that children are particularly vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Building a road next a school would seem to be ignoring that advice. Any traffic not using that link road would be using Swing Gate Lane which is not suitable for heavy levels of traffic and passes the front of one of the schools again increasing air pollution.

Finally I am strongly opposed to the extensive utilisation of Green Belt land which I understand can only be built on in "exceptional circumstances" - but now appears to be the target of a developer land grab.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7680

**Person ID** 1265010

**Full Name** Kerry Arnold

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Overall, I do not object to ensuring that there is sufficient housing and acknowledge that we have to ensure that there are a greater number of homes for people. However, not only are do we have a housing crisis but also a climate crisis.

The Dacorum Plan does not, in my view, address these concerns in a holistic way. It also does not sufficiently challenge the targets given, it rolls over to provide these huge number of houses, without questioning whether they are all really required.

The strategy for Berkhamsted allows for the development of expensive houses rather than more affordable housing. Affordable housing is what is needed to allow those who are currently priced out of the market to secure their future. All the sites in Berkhamsted are owned by speculative developers who are driven by profit, not the provision of homes for people. Lower cost accommodation, such as flats or apartments, can be built in more than two storeys and particularly importantly on brownfield sites.

The plan has not been developed taking into account the post covid era, where the signs are that we will have a lot of office space standing empty creating perfect brownfield sites for more affordable accommodation. Further exploration of the location of these sites should be carried out – and developed first. Greenbelt must be a last resort and only where it is clearly identified that further homes are required.

The greenbelt around Berkhamsted is all situation at the top of the valley. None of these sites are practical for cycling or walking into the High Street, the train station or to access local transport. The steep hills make it unrealistic to expect families to walk back up the hill for a long distance with heavy shopping, for example. The geography of Berkhamsted means it is impossible to develop the transport infrastructure, parking, additional retail to allow for such a huge increase to residencies. But, of course, developers like to build in Berkhamsted because of the large prices which executive homes can attract, they are not interested in meeting the accommodation and services needs of the local community.

Tring will be similarly increased, leading to even greater pressure for both towns on their infrastructures. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

The Plan in Dacorum takes the easy way out – focussing on simply taking up large swathes of green belt land without looking further and differently. The numbers are simply unrealistic and Dacorum should push back on the housing targets, concentrating more and more homes in the South East is simply not sustainable and does nothing to help investment in the UK as a whole. What is more, increasingly there will be less reliance on needing to be close to London.

While it is not included in the local plan, I wanted to comment on the Bourne End proposal from Thakeham. They include some good proposals regarding the sustainability of their development and sports facilities, however, I am fundamentally

opposed to the development in the space which will irrevocably join Bourne End and Berkhamsted and ultimately, Berkhamsted to Hemel – and given the expansion of Hemel through to Redbourn, this would create one huge town. The unique market town of Berkhamsted would no longer exist and so much green space would be lost. This should not be allowed to happen.

All developers should be forced to ensure that their develops meet high sustainability levels, and given that they stand to make such huge sums of money by ruining the very essence of our town, they should also be forced, not only to make the land available but build the facilities needed whether that is medical, sports or schools facilities.

But first the numbers must be challenged, the available brownfield sites should be reviewed over greenbelt and more affordable accommodation should be provided.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7685

**Person ID** 1261877

**Full Name** Suzanne Mitchell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

To whom it may concern I am writing to express by concern and objection to the proposals detailed in the Dacorum Borough Council Emerging Strategy for Growth.

I am concerned about the impact on the environment, traffic congestion and the infrastructure not to mention the loss of green belt. The road that I live on is extremely busy at all times of day, it can take my child a few minutes to be able to cross the road due to constant traffic. In the morning it can take 20 minutes to get out of or into Berkhamsted due to the level of traffic. Berkhamsted was built at a time and with road networks that are not able to absorb the amount of vehicular traffic. Further increasing housing will only exacerbate this issue.

Other areas of concern include:

- Impact on and loss of green belt land and areas of natural outstanding beauty
- Over provision of housing
- Failure to address climate issues
- Impact on infrastructure which is creaking at the seams
- impact on water supply and waste disposal
- Lack of brownfield regeneration proposals - why is this not the priority
- Over-reliance on growth strategies and partnership which have not been subject to public consultation and scrutiny
- The plan is at odds with the recent government desire to address the imbalance of investment between the north and south.

I object to these plans.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7686

**Person ID** 1265757

**Full Name** JENNIFER GAIL FREER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- —The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.
- Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There

is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

- The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.
- —There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).
- —Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.
- —There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.
- —This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7690

**Person ID** 1265760

**Full Name** Emma Kennedy

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I only recently got to hear about the local plan housing development proposals and am shocked at the scale of the developments and the impact they will have on the character of Northchurch in particular. I am very upset that so much green-belt land is going to be released for development. I believe the calculations overestimate the need for housing

and I therefore request that more green-belt and farm land be preserved for future generations. The view down and across the valley from our house will be severely damaged and I have concerns that the Northchurch fields are not safe to develop.

As a child going to St. Mary's I have first-hand experience of how dangerous that route is, and with even more traffic it will be positively lethal. The road is too narrow for such a reckless development.

I would also be very saddened for all the animals and plants that call that field home and object to them being deprived of their habitat.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7713

**Person ID** 1265766

**Full Name** Michelle Henderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I wish to **object** to the proposed plan based on the following points:

There is no sound logic or rationale re the numbers of houses to be built. The infrastructure is already struggling, congestion, public transport, lack of green transport support eg cycle paths and the doctors at Gossoms End cannot cope with the existing catchment area. In addition the development is on green belt which should be preserved. At a time when sustainability, climate and green issues are top of the the news agenda and the public (your voters) minds, this feels in complete contradiction and out of touch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7720

**Person ID** 1265767



<b>Full Name</b>	Carol King
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am horrified with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed for Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The housing numbers suggested are excessive and even exceed the forecast housing requirement for the Borough as calculated by the ONS.</p> <p>The impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate and seems to ignore the ongoing major development in the area ( Bearroc ) The proposals will severely impact infrastructure ( roads, schools, doctors surgeries etc ) pollution, congestion. road safety, local ecology, health and wellbeing of local residents. And please do not imagine that new residents will be lured by an easy access to the A41, they too want easy access to Berkhamsted Station, supermarkets, shops, parking, schools, sports etc within the existing Berkhamsted area. Currently we are living in an unrealistic pandemic and its easy to forget the frustrations of excessive traffic, parking and school runs. I totally disagree with the plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7723
<b>Person ID</b>	1265771
<b>Full Name</b>	Penella Warren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I write to object to the Local Plan above which is excessive in terms of the proposed number of dwellings for the whole of Dacorum but Berkhamsted and Northchurch in particular. I understand that they exceed the numbers suggested by the Office of National Statistics. The Local Plan readily agrees to the use of Green Belt land yet such land should only be used in exceptional circumstances. I cannot accept that all the proposed sites in Berkhamsted constitute exceptional circumstances. The concept of the Green Belt is very precious and once the land is lost it is lost forever. We already have to cope with results of the large Taylor Wimpey, Bearroc site in terms of extra traffic, pressure on schools and services, pollution and congestion. The enormous number of dwellings that have been built across the country must surely have reduced the demand for homes but maybe the problem is that relatively few have been affordable or social housing.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7724
<b>Person ID</b>	1265772
<b>Full Name</b>	Jill Colley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a Northchurch resident, I wish to register my objection to the above plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7725
<b>Person ID</b>	1265773
<b>Full Name</b>	Francesca Salmon

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>There are many reasons why I object to the Dacorum Local Plan, not least because of its destruction of our vitally important Green Belt and the lack of infrastructure to support it, but I think the number of proposed developments across Dacorum is excessive and I question the formula used to calculate it.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7729
<b>Person ID</b>	1265776
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Oldfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7738
<b>Person ID</b>	1265778
<b>Full Name</b>	Councillor Lara Pringle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p> <p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p>

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7753
<b>Person ID</b>	1265781
<b>Full Name</b>	Jon Keating
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i>  <i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7754

<b>Person ID</b>	1146062
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jon Salmon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid repeating the extensive points made in their response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>There are many reasons why I object to the Dacorum Local Plan, including its destruction of our vitally important Green Belt and the lack of infrastructure to support it. In addition, I think the number of proposed developments across Dacorum is excessive and I question the formula used to calculate it.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7757
<b>Person ID</b>	1264785
<b>Full Name</b>	Thomas Lloyd-Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7758
<b>Person ID</b>	1265790
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNE LLOYD-EVANS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7760
<b>Person ID</b>	1265792
<b>Full Name</b>	SARAH RANDALL-DAVIES

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7763
<b>Person ID</b>	1154385
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa Fridkin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please accept this email as confirmation of my support for the full and considered response already submitted by The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group to the Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038 Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. I confirm that I wish DBC to duplicate The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group's response in my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS7764
<b>Person ID</b>	226125
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Ian Hines
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7765
<b>Person ID</b>	1146111
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Catherine Salmon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p>

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7767

**Person ID** 1265797

**Full Name** LEVENE IVAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7768

**Person ID** 1265799

**Full Name** JOANNA ROBINSON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7769
<b>Person ID</b>	1158621
<b>Full Name</b>	Monika & Casper Gibilaro
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing in response to the Draft Local Plan 2020-2038 Consultation. I would like to register my strong objection to some of the proposals contained within the "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)" which is to set out DBC's approach to accommodating further growth across the Borough.</p> <p>Please register my very strong objection to the choice of several of the development sites which are contained within the Plan, in particular sites within Berkhamsted as I live in the town.</p> <p>I fully support Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) who have responded to the consultation on all points. I request that you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name and in particular BRAG's responses in respect of sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24 and 25.</p>

In addition to BRAG's response, my objection is also focused upon four fundamental grounds which are as follows:

- 1 The housing growth proposed in this draft Plan is unsustainable development and should be rejected as it will have detrimental impact of the Borough and the wellbeing of its residents, which is against the Council's Environmental Plan/Policy .
- 2 The Council has wrongly based its calculations on the outdated 2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them. No doubt the Council is aware that on Wednesday 16 December 2020 a response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system was published by the Government . This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government acknowledged that meeting housing needs should not be a reason to unacceptable loss of the Green Belt and its protected landscapes. The need to deliver housing needs does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."
- 3 Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land. The Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". However, it is evident that in meeting the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the "over-inflated" housing need, the Council proposes that, as a necessity, development must, therefore, take place on Green Belt land or land that is specially designated for other purposes. 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; these are for many people the prime reasons that they have chosen to live in this area.
- 4 Adequate Supportive Infrastructure. The proposed developments on Green Belt land around Berkhamsted do not take into account the local infrastructure which is already put under strain. The Plan does not provide sufficient consideration of upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments.

As a resident of Dacorum Borough I request for my objection to be noted and taken fully into account consideration as the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation will have detrimental impact on the local communities and the wellbeing of its residents; it contradicts the Council's Environmental Policies and most importantly includes unjustified proposal for loss of invaluable Green Belt and its protected landscapes.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7773

**Person ID** 1265891

**Full Name** james arnold

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The greenbelt around Berkhamsted is all situated at the top of the valley. None of these sites are practical for cycling or walking into the High Street, the train station or to access local transport. The steep hills make it unrealistic to expect families to walk back up the hill for a long distance with heavy shopping, for example. The geography of Berkhamsted means it is impossible to develop the transport infrastructure, parking, additional retail to allow for such a huge increase to residencies.</p> <p>Tring will be similarly increased, leading to even greater pressure for both towns on their infrastructures. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7775
<b>Person ID</b>	1265892
<b>Full Name</b>	Madeleine Woodstock
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7777
<b>Person ID</b>	1265893
<b>Full Name</b>	James Moodie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7779
<b>Person ID</b>	1265894
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Cutler
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7780

**Person ID** 1265896

**Full Name** Mark Cutler

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  
The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7783

**Person ID** 1265899

**Full Name** Nick Clayton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have been reading over the last few months the proposals to expand the town by some 2236 over the next 17years &amp; find it totally incomprehensible that any governing body could propose such a plan, effectively increasing the population by up to 10000 people &amp; amongst a myriad of other issues, destroying a huge swathe of the local green belt !!</p> <p>My family &amp; I have lived in Berkhamsted for 34 years having originally chosen the town &amp; neighbouring area for its unspoilt character, size of town, heritage, proximity to green space &amp; and on the fringes of an area of outstanding beauty .</p> <p>This proposed housing &amp; dramatic population increase would undoubtably destroy the dynamic/characteristics that I have described above &amp; wipe out the benefits &amp; reasons that us, &amp; others, originally decided to live here in the first place !!</p> <p>Considerable development has already taken place in Berkhamsted along the London Rd &amp; is still continuing in other parts of town on a substantial scale ie Bearroc Park stages 1 &amp;2 &amp; other adjacent ongoing developments.</p> <p>These areas alone have caused a significant increase in population &amp; traffic.</p> <p>The Shootersway suburb of the town which used to be regarded as a quiet area serviced by a narrow country lane, is now a busy &amp;noisy throughfare used by all types of traffic 7 days a week !!</p> <p>In closure, THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROPSALS, need halting &amp; a complete rethink. Consideration must be given to searching for brown field sites, or those areas more appropriate to the development of thousands of houses, rather than completely &amp; irreversible destroying a beautiful town &amp; its environs .</p> <p>WE MUST NOT GET SUCKED IN BY GET RICH QUICK PLANNERS &amp; DEVEVELOPERS who are quite happy to destroy the landscape for ever, &amp; vanish to enjoy their millions !!!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7812
<b>Person ID</b>	1265812
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Shelagh Reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to protest about the number of houses you are proposing to build in Northchurch and Berkhamsted. I think it is an outrage that you are even considering selling off large chunks of Green Belt for housing. I am strongly opposed to housing being built along the canal side near the canal bridge in New Road, the bridge is already a bottleneck and would cause more queueing traffic to get onto the main road in Northchurch not to mention adding to the already congested road into Berkhamsted, together with the additional pollution.</p> <p>I am also very much opposed to any further development between Darrs Lane and Durrants Road. Darrs Lane is already a busy road and 400 new homes would create increasing pollution as 400 new homes could mean 800 further cars, most family homes have 2 plus cars. Our local roads, especially Darrs Lane, are already in terrible condition, will the Council be able to keep up with repairs?</p> <p>It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment in Northchurch/Berkhamsted, our schools are overflowing and our roads are congested. I think the Council should think again before going ahead with these and the other 2,000 home projected to be built in this area in the coming years. Our villages ought to be protected from this kind of irresponsible planning and the greed of large building companies. The vast majority of these houses will be beyond the reach of first time buyers and people on lower incomes who will be forced to move away to obtain housing.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7839
<b>Person ID</b>	1265916
<b>Full Name</b>	Susan Edwards
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I object to the proposed local plan for Dacorum, which has been based on incorrect statistics. With regard to BK06, West Berkhamsted, although it is actually Northchurch, I realise that more houses need to be built in the area but too many houses, 200 of the wrong type are proposed and the only people that will benefit are the developers selling off the green belt. What we need in this area is good affordable social housing using brown-field sites, not using green belt land. There has been too much green belt land built on already in this area and the local roads cannot cope with the extra traffic.

I would like to draw your attention to The National Planning Policy Framework set out by the government in 2019, Chapter 13 Protecting Green Belt Land. It's states that:

**133. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.**

**134. Green Belt serves five purposes:**

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;**
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;**
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;**
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and**
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.**

Why is the National Planning Policy Framework being ignored? Surely it was put in place to protect the green belt? How much work has been undertaken to identify brown field sites that could be used in the area instead of green belt land?

We should be protecting our green belt for future generations, not destroying it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7850

**Person ID** 1265917

**Full Name** Max Dinning

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I live in (address removed) Berkhamsted and are greatly concerned by proposals for nearly 2000 new dwellings in the town. This means a population increase of a minimum of ten to fifteen thousand people, with at least 3000 cars. The issues raised by this increase in population are manifold.</p> <p>The road structure will become clogged. Given the hilly nature of the town and the distance to the centre, people will be unable to walk or cycle as is promoted, but will use cars. This will rise emissions, and lead to major congestion.</p> <p>The Dacorum Local Plan (to 2038) does not sufficiently consider the government’s Ten Point Plan for a Green Industrial Revolution (Nov 2020), or the government’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (April 2017) – and may consequently leave the council vulnerable to legal action.</p> <p>Specifically, references in the Plan regarding contributions to “off-site enhancements to the local road network” do not clearly delineate plans for traffic calming measures and segregated cycle lanes/footpaths, which would reduce air pollution and increase the viability of walking and cycling for short journeys in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>West Berkhamsted currently has an average of 1.48 motor vehicles per household, in 2,401 households. According to the plan, the proposed development in the West Berkhamsted area will create 1,860 households – which will lead to 2,753 additional motor vehicles on Berkhamsted roads, with next-to no commitment to sustainable local travel provision for the thousands of families in the town.</p> <p>Most of the additional motor vehicles will frequently use Shootersway and Kings Road for commuting and town centre access. The junction of these two roads has already seen a deterioration in air quality since the opening of Bearroc Park and the multistorey car park. The air quality at the junction of the high street and Kings Road has also degraded in the same period. Both junctions are a thoroughfare for school children as they make their way to local primary and secondary schools – currently with negligible infrastructure to support them.</p> <p>The infrastructure of the town will be overwhelmed</p> <p>Health services are already stretched, as is education provision, and both of these will be adversely affected and possibly overwhelmed.</p> <p>Damage will be done to the local environment which is on the edge of the Chilterns and currently much of the area, especially south of the town, is green belt land which acts as a buffer between Berkhamsted and surrounding towns.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7852
<b>Person ID</b>	1265918
<b>Full Name</b>	Tim Clay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my objections to the Dacorum Local Plan, specifically with regards to the plans for building additional housing in and around Berkhamsted where the roads are already under strain at busy times of day. The additional houses planned would make this existing problem worse, especially with housing at Bearroc Park phase 2 already under construction.</p> <p>I would request that the plan is revisited with more focus on the impact on local infrastructure (road, schools etc), pollution, congestion and road safety among other aspects as I do not believe that much of this additional development is either necessary or well considered.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7873
<b>Person ID</b>	1265975
<b>Full Name</b>	Clare Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>(23)  Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p> <p>(24)  This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7875
<b>Person ID</b>	1145502
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Guy Dawkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There seem to me to be substantial discrepancies between different parts of this strategy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Between the overall stated objectives of the plan and the proposed implementation, e.g. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Conserving and protecting the natural environment while proposing around 90% of the development for Berkhamsted is on Green Belt.</li> <li>2 Supporting community health, wellbeing and cohesion, while removing much Green Belt land, a now-more-than-ever recognised source of solace and wellbeing, currently readily accessible from the town.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Mitigating and adapting to climate change while requiring people to drive to get to green spaces, particularly as</li> </ol>

- 1 There is nothing in the proposals for Berkhamsted that promotes and facilitates sustainable transport and connectivity.
- 2 Ensuring an attractive and valued built and historic environment while overwhelming the scale of the two market towns, Berkhamsted and Tring, with developments utterly disproportionate to their size while
- 3 There is nothing in the proposals about generating a vibrant economy with opportunities for all *in Berkhamsted*.
  - Based on past experience it is hard to have any confidence at all in the council's ability to enable the delivery of infrastructure when the provision of GP facilities is already extremely stretched, water extraction is currently capped, schools are under pressure annually to accommodate growing numbers of children, to say nothing of other services, such as sewerage.
  - Similarly, it is hard to have any confidence in the high levels of 'affordable' homes to be built when the track record over my years shows otherwise. In any case 'affordable' in Berkhamsted is a dubious proposition where social housing might much better fill gaps in provision.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7877

**Person ID** 1145502

**Full Name** Mr Guy Dawkins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I think it is not special pleading to say that, for several reasons, Berkhamsted is a particularly unsuitable location for significant expansion:

- 1 It is a long, thin valley bottom town which has, over time, inevitably expanded up the valley sides to meet, but not encroach much upon, the surrounding countryside. This means that increases in housing, where they are not infill, occur at increasing distances from the town centre. This necessitates people driving to the station to commute by train or into town for shopping resulting in noted increases in pollution and the need to build an eyesore of a multi-storey carpark.
- 2 The town is not, and will not be, even with the proposed expansion, large enough to support a comprehensive bus service that would serve to mitigate some of the congestion that arises.

- 3 As mentioned above, GP surgeries are stretched to breaking point, schools regularly have to decline pupils, who are then referred on to schools in Hemel Hempstead, et. Etc.
- 4 The town has previously exceeded building targets set for it in previous plans. This is likely to be less to do with any enthusiasm to meet these targets than the incentive provided to developers that they can build a small number of large homes on a small plot and sell them for between one and two million pound each. There does not seem to have been an equivalent density of unaffordable 'affordable' homes, still less an over supply of social housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7878

**Person ID** 1265980

**Full Name** Colette Llewellyn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have been reviewing the local development plan for Dacorum for 2020-2038, and I wish to object to the plan as it stands. The plan includes building too many of the wrong houses in the wrong places. The building plans will ruin acres of our beautiful countryside and Green Belt land, turning fields into giant housing estates. The development at "Bulbourne Cross" is an example of this. Moreover, this development only includes one provision for education: an additional primary school. If thousands of houses are built there (and in the other sites referred to in the development plan), there will be potentially thousands more children needing education in our area. One primary school will not meet the needs of all of those extra children. There is no extra provision for secondary schools. I'm not sure Ashlyns will be able to cope with 1000s of new students every year. It does not have the staff, space or facilities to increase ten-fold in size to meet the needs of thousands of extra children.

It will also mean thousands more people needing to access healthcare and other town facilities in Berkhamsted; not least the doctors, dentists, and Watford General hospital. None of these facilities could cope with a mass influx of extra patients. Where is the provision for these extra facilities in the plan?

The development of edge of town areas will also bring a huge influx of people into Berkhamsted town centre on a daily basis where there just isn't the parking available for thousands and thousands more cars, when the new residents pop into town to do their shopping, or commute to London for example.

As someone who lives on a road central to town, I already experience plenty of extra cars on a daily basis on our road which makes finding a space tricky that is not too far from your home. As a resident, you should surely have the right to park close to your home, and not be displaced by temporary visitors to the town centre. There is no provision for extra parking in town - and no space either for another car park. A huge increase in cars on the high street would also inevitably lead to an increase in pollution as well, putting pedestrians' health at risk.

The building works will also damage our beautiful setting of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Nature has been proven to be so important to our mental health, particularly in these current testing times, and taking it away from the current residents (human and animal) is not right.

For these reasons, I state my objection to the Dacorum Local Development Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7881

**Person ID** 1265983

**Full Name** Elgiva Leveridge

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>As a local resident I am extremely worried about the plan to build so many new homes, especially in south Berkhamsted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the developments will result in massively increased traffic and congestion on Swing Gate Lane, nearby roads and Berkhamsted High St because the homes will be too far up a steep hill for people to walk/cycle anywhere</li> <li>- Swing Gate Lane will become very busy and unsafe for hundreds of children walking to Swing Gate and Thomas Coram schools every day</li> <li>- pollution levels will increase for local residents and children in the two schools</li> <li>- there are not enough school places available at any level in Berkhamsted to accommodate so many new homes</li> <li>- the fields and wooded areas at the top of Swing Gate Lane are green belt land which supports wildlife and enables local families to access the outdoors without driving anywhere.</li> </ul> <p>Development on the scale proposed will have a massive negative impact on Berkhamsted's residents.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7882
<b>Person ID</b>	1265984
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS SELINA GALE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to express my concern and objection to proposals contained in the Dacorum Borough Council Emerging Strategy for Growth. In particular, I am concerned about the size of the proposed development, which is alarming, and considering the size of the proposals for Berkhamsted in particular, the infrastructure required to support what appears to be an over provision of housing, is untenable. There will also be a huge impact on our local community and on roads, including traffic congestion, and the potential for even higher over crowding on our rail networks.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the impact the proposals will have on the countryside, our wildlife and on the environment more generally, including pollution and poor air quality. I am deeply concerned about the loss of green belt land and parts of the Chilterns AONB and Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation.</p>

I am also concerned about the impact the development will have on our water supply and waste water disposal.

The proposals appear not to have addressed climate emergency issues, there are a lack of brownfield regeneration proposals and an over-reliance on growth strategies and partnerships which have not been subject to public consultation and scrutiny. In addition, the Plan is at odds with the recent government desire to address the imbalance of investment between the north and south of England. Post-Covid in particular it is likely that there will be a reduced requirement to live and work in London and the South East.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7887

**Person ID** 1265985

**Full Name** PAUL ELLERAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

— Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.

— The policies do not take into account the impact of the Covid pandemic. The changes in lifestyle necessitated through the move towards home based and remote working, and increased flexibility towards home/work balance have not been properly taken into account.

— The plan does not take into account the likely increase in empty retail or office space in town centres as a result of the Covid changes, missing a once in a generation opportunity for change.

—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7888
<b>Person ID</b>	1265985
<b>Full Name</b>	PAUL ELLERAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7895
<b>Person ID</b>	1265989
<b>Full Name</b>	TIM JONES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7900
<b>Person ID</b>	1265991
<b>Full Name</b>	NICHOLAS MORGAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	— Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors'

appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.

— The policies do not take into account the impact of the Covid pandemic. The changes in lifestyle necessitated through the move towards home based and remote working, and increased flexibility towards home/work balance have not been properly taken into account.

— The plan does not take into account the likely increase in empty retail or office space in town centres as a result of the Covid changes, missing a once in a generation opportunity for change.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7902

**Person ID** 1265991

**Full Name** NICHOLAS MORGAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7918

**Person ID** 1265995

**Full Name** REBECCA HARTE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Secondly, no matter what nonsensical statistics are dreamt up for our local area in Westminster, the fact of the matter is that we lack the infrastructure to support a significant increase in population. This is not something that can be rectified without an enormous and devastating demolition of supposedly protected Greenbelt land. Once it is gone, it is gone and we will be all the poorer for the loss.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7919

**Person ID** 1265995

**Full Name** REBECCA HARTE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am sorry to say that, having witnessed attempts by the local authority to provide solutions in the form of the traffic lights at the top of Kings Road and the temporary car park in the field opposite the train station, I have absolutely no faith in their ability to provide safe and workable solutions to the problems that an increase in building will create. The proposed exit road near Dudswell is located in a very dangerous spot, given the volume and speed of traffic in that area currently. You should not need me to tell you how often our village is used as a main route when there are accidents or congestion on the A41. You should also not need me to tell you that a girl was killed by a van outside the Almshouses in Northchurch and yet, instead of insisting on a mandatory reduction in speed to 20mph to make our village safer, there are plans being pushed through to significantly increase the volume of traffic. Not to mention unsafe levels of air pollution that are frequently being recorded outside St Mary's School on Northchurch High Street. As the parent of a severely asthmatic child (requiring two ambulances in the past two months), this is an issue that could have fatal consequences.</p> <p>There are some things that are more important than money and I would really like to urge you to consider these, before you destroy our village beyond repair.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7920
<b>Person ID</b>	1265996
<b>Full Name</b>	REBECCA MITCHELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing with great concerns that are planned for our beautiful Green Belt with the development of more houses. With the recent lockdown times it has been so obvious how lucky we are to live in an area with natural green areas. Development will eradicate those areas that makes Berkhamsted so beautiful.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly object to these plans and wish those in charge can see the long term implications of such a plan.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7934
<b>Person ID</b>	1265997
<b>Full Name</b>	ROSE SHERIDAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.</p> <p>— The policies do not take into account the impact of the Covid pandemic. The changes in lifestyle necessitated through the move towards home based and remote working, and increased flexibility towards home/work balance have not been properly taken into account.</p> <p>— The plan does not take into account the likely increase in empty retail or office space in town centres as a result of the Covid changes, missing a once in a generation opportunity for change.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7936
<b>Person ID</b>	1265997
<b>Full Name</b>	ROSE SHERIDAN



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7948
<b>Person ID</b>	1265998
<b>Full Name</b>	BRYONY CLARK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Personal reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I chose to live in Northchurch because of its semi-rural location, offering a fresh air for our asthmatic son. He often has to use his inhaler when walking to school along the High Street. Despite living on the edge of an AONB, there have already been higher than expected levels of pollution measured, even during lockdown periods. The additional car journeys due to the proposed plan would have a huge detrimental effect on the air quality;</li> <li>• Another reason we chose Northchurch was that it has an identity as a village. My sons absolutely feel part of this village: they go to St Mary's Church; attend the local school and Northchurch Cubs. The number of houses proposed for Northchurch and merging with Berkhamsted will inevitably take away this identity, making us part of urban sprawl.</li> <li>• My 9 and 5 year-old sons attend St Mary's school and we already have considerable safety concerns due to the narrow pavements and busy roads running through town. We have suffered the death of a young girl on the busy main road in recent years and the Northchurch Go20 residents group was established to deal with the considerable traffic issues faced in the village. I can only describe the experience of walking young children along the narrow pavements as a 'nightmare'..I will be reluctant to let my sons have the important developmental experience of walking on their own school on their own if the traffic is increased, especially along Darr's Lane, this is (official school policy for Y5&amp;6 children)</li> <li>• My family and I regularly use the public footpath on the site in Darrs Lane for an easily accessible nature walk. The loss of this would have a detrimental impact on our physical and mental health;</li> <li>• We live adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The over-development of green belt here, over and above more suitable urban and brown field sites, would be devastating for this country and for future generations.</li> <li>• I believe the process of consultation has been flawed, with many residents unaware of the existence of the plan. We received a brochure from Dacorum this Tuesday, 22 February (postmarked 21 February 2021), giving us only</li> </ul>

5 days to respond during a national Coronavirus lockdown and while working, homeschooling two young children and caring for a 90 year-old. I do not feel this is anywhere near a reasonable attempt to engage me in consultation on a major proposal to develop the borough. To put the onus onto over-stretched, exhausted families to inform fellow isolated, non-online residents (of which there are many in Northchurch) is totally unrealistic and undemocratic.

I trust that you will now make the right decision to re-visit this flawed proposal, engage properly with the whole community, investigate brown field and urban sites in the borough which are more suited to development. You have a chance now to place great importance on protecting our green belt (in line with Government policy, see *Appendix 1*) and safeguarding the countryside, its biodiversity and, ultimately, the planet for future generations.

### ***Appendix 1***

#### **An excerpt from The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)**

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green belts are their openness and their permanence.

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- 1 **To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;**
- 2 **To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;**
- 3 **To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;**
- 4 **To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and**
- 5 **To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and redundant land**

#### **Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
--------------	-------------------------------

<b>ID</b>	EGS7954
-----------	---------

<b>Person ID</b>	1266002
------------------	---------

<b>Full Name</b>	ROXANNE RANSLEY
------------------	-----------------

#### **Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
---------------------------	--

<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
<b>* Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	No evidence to support unreasonable growth around Tring and Berkhamsted. Green belt development against gov guidelines, no evidence of current situation consideration.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7963
<b>Person ID</b>	1266005
<b>Full Name</b>	ELEANOR SUTTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request that you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7969
<b>Person ID</b>	1266006
<b>Full Name</b>	SUE ELLERAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7978
<b>Person ID</b>	1266008
<b>Full Name</b>	KAREN WHITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7979
<b>Person ID</b>	1265137
<b>Full Name</b>	jane Pawar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>In particularly, I object to the loss of green belt, for which the "exceptional" reasons for developing have been not been made clear, the particular topography of Berkhamsted which makes growth of the town centre and infrastructure unfeasible, the danger to children and other pedestrians as well as pollution from increased traffic flow, the already oversubscribed secondary school and lastly the lack of additional employment opportunities meaning that even more pressure will be placed on the rail network which is already inadequate for the number of commuters needing it.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7980
<b>Person ID</b>	1265137
<b>Full Name</b>	jane Pawar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7982
<b>Person ID</b>	1266011
<b>Full Name</b>	LAUREN FRANKEL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Hello, I've lived in south Berkhamsted for the past 7 years. I am strongly opposed to the proposal to create new housing at the top of Swing Gate Lane. My six year old son who has lived in south Berkhamsted since he was born developed asthma at a young age (he has been treated for it since he was 2) and I believe that a strong contributing factor is the level of traffic pollution outside our home (his bedroom overlooks Hilltop Road). I fear that additional development as well as destruction of green belt land will create higher levels of air pollution in our area, our homes, and our streets.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7984
<b>Person ID</b>	1266012
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON EDWARDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted. This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.</p> <p>— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion,  — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne  — reduced water pressure  — there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7993
<b>Person ID</b>	1266015
<b>Full Name</b>	SOPHIE WHITTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7994
<b>Person ID</b>	1266015
<b>Full Name</b>	SOPHIE WHITTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>a) Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch, including myself, are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>b)The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>c) There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition). Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street.</p>

d) Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses. There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

e) This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7998

**Person ID** 1266015

**Full Name** SOPHIE WHITTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

i) Clearly Covid has had a dramatic impact on train travel in and out of Berkhamsted station. However, if this does return to the level pre-covid, it should be noted that there was considerable congestion at the station car park, with spaces regularly unavailable past 930am Monday-Thursday. With the developments planned on top of steep hills in Northchurch in particular, it must be expected that many of these residents if commuters will drive to the station, increasing congestion in the station carpark, as well as the routes to/from (Northchurch high street, Billet lane, Bridgewater road). Traffic around the junction of Darrs lane, Northchurch high street and the Tesco metro is already very busy and it is regularly congested at all times of day, but especially between 730 - 9am and 5-6pm.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8005

**Person ID** 1266018

<b>Full Name</b>	LYNDSEY PIERCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names:-</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8006
<b>Person ID</b>	1266019
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIC PIERCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names:-</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8007
<b>Person ID</b>	1266020
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID BANNISTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>To add to this I strongly disagree with any development on green belt land for any purpose</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8008
<b>Person ID</b>	1266021
<b>Full Name</b>	ANGELA GILBERT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG`s responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8015
<b>Person ID</b>	399431
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Nield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The plan to build 2236 house in Berkhamsted is excessive. The planned development off Shootersway does not sufficiently take into account the nature of the area such as supporting roads. The idea of 1 junction from the A41 will only add to the issue and is ill-conceived.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8020
<b>Person ID</b>	1264067
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Honeyman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having recently moved to south berkhamsted from a more built up location for a greener, cleaner lifestyle for my young son and future expanding family, it is a real shame to see all the proposed building plans for south berkhamsted. There is no question that the volume of traffic on Shootersway will increase considerably under the proposed development plans and i was expecting my children to be able to attend greenway school via walking or cycling safely. As well as the added air traffic pollution that will come with all the extra vehicles likely to be owned by the people in these new dwellings. The town roads are not set up to take on these extra measures whilst keeping emissions down and safety high. The town is set on a deep valley, and so to believe that people will walk to the high street (and back up very steep hills) with shopping, in the cold, or with children on a regular basis is laughable. Therefore traffic WILL increase and can overload the road infrastructure.</p> <p>The amount of dwellings proposed all over the town of berkhamsted will surely diminish its character as a market town and lead to its demise as a desirable area to live in.</p> <p>Our green belt land also acts as a buffer between Berkhamsted and surrounding towns, and our environment is sacred. I feel other sites and towns will be better equipped to take on some of this mass of building.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8025
<b>Person ID</b>	1162171
<b>Full Name</b>	Emma Duke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8034

**Person ID** 1266034

**Full Name** GRANT TUNMER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Not enough care has been taken to protect the local ecology, the demand for water will damage the aquifer and the internationally recognised chalk streams that we have in the area. On top of that the plans are not carbon neutral and conflict with commitments to tackle climate change as the houses proposed are not near employment or transport hubs and so will encourage people to use cars.

The increased populations in Tring and Berkhamsted will mean more traffic travelling along Northchurch High Street, leading to congestion, increased pollution, health problems, road safety concerns especially for my children and their friends walking to school.

Northchurch is not West Berkhamsted and referring to it as such in the planning documents denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8036

<b>Person ID</b>	1266035
<b>Full Name</b>	EILEEN PALMER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have considered the the above proposal and wish to *object* to it on the following grounds:</p> <p>The development is on Greenbelt land.</p> <p>There have been numerous housing developments in the town over the years which I did not object to as consideration has to be given to housing needs. However, a development of this size will be to the detriment of Berkhamsted. The present infrastructure will not sustain this large development</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8050
<b>Person ID</b>	1266040
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID BRADBURY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	It has been shown that the plans are based on out-of-date statistics.



The number of houses planned is on green belt land and would fundamentally change the character of Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring. Northchurch isn't even referred to by name in the plan and, by having large areas of green belt filled with housing, would be part of a continuous sprawl. Northchurch is referred to as West Berkhamsted - do the people responsible for this plan even live in Dacorum?

As a resident of Northchurch with primary school age children there are already issues of there not being enough places at the only secondary school in the town - Ashlyns. The vast majority of the new houses will be built quite close to Ashlyns therefore pushing more children and families, who are already live here, out. The school is already accepting 9 form entry in 2021, which is seen as exceptional and not a long term solution.

Where are the plans and guarantees that a much-needed new secondary school will be built?

The plans appear to be well-designed to make life for developers very easy, by developing virgin green belt rather than brownfield sites, and life for existing residents intolerable.

The infrastructure in the area is already at breaking point. Pollution in Northchurch, on the high street where the primary school is, is at a dangerous level. The footpaths are dangerously narrow and inadequate. The speed limits are routinely ignored and putting more traffic on these roads is irresponsible and seems likely to be risking another incident that resulted in the death of a local child at the hands of a distracted van driver relatively recently.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8051

**Person ID** 1152837

**Full Name** Suzanne Jannese

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* **Yes**  
\* **No**

## Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment

The sites do not meet sustainability assessment requirements as set by Dacorum BC. The sites conflict with Dacorum's own plan policies.

Bk07 – Lock Field – shown be delisted. It is unsuitable for development.

The infrastructure demands to absorb this population growth have been ignored.

Site design proposals (SPD's) have not been drafted, so no details what proposed in depth for each site'

Have not considered that "Shootersway" be considered as one overall neighbourhood "community" development – not 7 separate, non-contiguous sites, where separate developer objectives would deliver sub optimal social outcomes.

That the plan to date has insufficiently covered the social isolation impacts of these sites, in particular sites Bk06 and Bk08, and how these sites can best be fully absorbed into the community.

No real attempt, or acceptance of commitments, to finding supporting transport solutions for these new, dispersed sites has been forthcoming, e.g. bus services.

As presented the Draft Local Plan does not address for the existing population how their existing social assets and facilities will be maintained and not overwhelmed. How, as far as is practical, will existing quality of life standards be protected, maintained, and where shortfalls currently exist that they would be addressed.

will not seek to increase road capacity". (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer)

Attrition against car uses, by resisting road improvement and adding to congestion, makes life difficult for everyone. More congestion, traffic delays, parking problems will impact by default on all - pedestrians, cyclists, bus users, commercial road users et al.

The Draft Local Plan is likely to create a "Catch 22". Wasting resources by tinkering at edge and not addressing crux of the problems,

More car usage is unavoidable, if population / housing is to be expanded. Not expanding and remodelling road infrastructure are not an acceptable alternative. Dacorum's approach is not in accord with Hertfordshire's Transport Plan (LTP4).

Dacorum's Local Plan is not in keeping with its own attitudes in its Draft Site Sustainability Appraisals and its Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The latter saying for the Shootersway sites.

"Development of this site would likely result in an increase in traffic to and from the site at peak hours, which would have a limited impact upon the local road network. If larger scale growth is proposed in the south west of Berkhamsted, it is likely that this would give rise to further traffic issues along Shootersway, particularly at the junction with the A416/Kings Road and the A41 junction. "

For Darr's Lane, wording is amplified:

"...Development is likely to have an impact on the local road network at peak periods, including along Shootersway and Kings Road/A416. Significant improvements would likely be required, including enhancements to Darr's Lane, Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted High Street, Shootersway, Kings Road and the A416. "

Similar remarks are included in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (App B) that some of the sites are relatively close to bus transport :

Haslems Field = "Site is a 15-20 minute walk from the frequent 500/501 service

to Watford. The 502 and 532 bus service to Hemel Hempstead is a 10 minute walk and is infrequent in comparison to the 500/501 service. “  
 Darr’s Lane = “Site is within walking distance to the frequent 500 bus services to both Watford and Aylesbury. Site is also within walking distance to the less frequent bus service of 532 to Hemel Hempstead.  
 A site of this scale has the potential to provide new/enhanced public transport connections with the existing town and wider area. “ Sites might be 15-20 minutes walk to access the A4251 and main bus services. BUT Up-hill on way home tired, then time = ??  
 What about on cold winter days, dark morning and dark evenings??  
 Equally not easy for young mum with young family in tow during the daytime – particularly on bad weather days. What about infirm etc. Now add to above, for Darr’s Lane, that for half of the 1.2Km walk to the A4251, the route is single-track, no street-lights, and no pathways.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8056

**Person ID** 334211

**Full Name** Dr Dorothy Watt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I'm writing to respond to the Local Plan, Berkhamsted in particular. I strongly disagree with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed. These numbers are excessive and well above the forecasted needs according to the most up-to-date ONS figures. The impact on West Berkhamsted in particular is disproportionate and does not take into account existing and recent major developments in the area (Bearroc Park) and severely impacts existing infrastructure which is already inadequate. There seems to be little thought given to the experience of both existing and potentially new residents in terms of facilities around Shootersway (which have always been non-existent) and that inevitably puts more pressure on the already inadequate town centre. Berkhamsted has very few central facilities and more houses will only exacerbate this issue.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8063
<b>Person ID</b>	1266045
<b>Full Name</b>	GRAHAM GILBERT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object to the Dacorum Local Plan specifically regarding the proposed Berkhamsted development which will in my opinion cause considerably increased traffic congestion in the Shooters Way area, a part of the town where at present, pedestrian school children compete with motorised traffic. This proposal will significantly increase the number and therefore the danger of walking along the inadequate footpath between Cross Oak and Kings Road as well increasing the considerable congestion by Edgerton and Westfield schools</p> <p>The number of proposed dwellings will greatly increase the congestion in the town centre, overwhelm the existing ( including new Lower Kings Road) car parks, over stretch the medical and dental facilities.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8064
<b>Person ID</b>	1266046
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHI BRETT-LEE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation which I strongly object to.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8070
<b>Person ID</b>	1266048
<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL MORGAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</li> <li>Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</li> </ul>

- The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.
- —There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).
- —Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.
- —There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.
- —This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8081

**Person ID** 1164738

**Full Name** Jane Collis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing about the draft Local Plan consultation with specific reference to Berkhamsted and Northchurch and wish to wholeheartedly register my opposition to the development of Green Belt sites around both settlements.

All proposed developments on green belt land between the A41 and the existing residential development will have irreversible repercussions on the environment, the nature and character of our settlements, town/village centre congestion and quality of life for residents and opportunities for local people to buy and rent homes, on the grounds of:

- loss of important areas of habitat and lungs / buffer zones between the A41 and Berkhamsted/Northchurch. They were left as green belt and agricultural land in the first place for a reason!
- excessive car journeys that will be inevitable from proposed green belt settlements. The creation of satellite developments will create huge pressure on the high streets and town centres, with untenable congestion and further degradation of already poor air quality
- the lack of public amenity, and infrastructure accompanying the proposals and the huge pressure on already inadequate community space in town / village centres
- the lack of any consideration of the impact of the pandemic on the local economy and working/commuting patterns
- the near merging of Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring as a corridor sprawling northwards along the A41 from the M25
- the lack of employment planning that should accompany a plan of this scope, with potentially near on new 5,000 dwellings in Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring but no indication of how / where local employment will be
- the inadequacy of the consultation period and process. It is unthinkable for DBC to claim that this virtual-only consultation during the pandemic has given local people opportunity to view, consider and respond to the Local Plan.

I support the submissions already made to DBC by - BRAG <https://www.nosouthberkhamstedconcept.com/about-brag/> and <https://www.swhertslabour.org.uk/2021/02/12/dacorum-local-plan-labours-response/>

More generally, I support the development of brownfield sites within Berkhamsted and Northchurch with more compact, higher rise (3 storey) solutions for affordable and social housing, with easy access by foot and bike to the centres and amenities of our settlements.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8087
<b>Person ID</b>	1266052
<b>Full Name</b>	GEORGINA THOMSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please accept this as my response to the local plan consultation.</p> <p>I have reviewed and wish to support and duplicate the detailed points made in the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group response objecting to this proposed development.</p> <p>The scale of the proposals are completely inappropriate for an area with green belt bordering on an AONB, whose infrastructure is already stretched to capacity, and in a time of climate crisis where environmental sustainability must be front and centre of town planning and development. They would radically harm the character and environment of the existing communities, especially Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8090
<b>Person ID</b>	1266049
<b>Full Name</b>	Mike Plowman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8103
<b>Person ID</b>	1266059
<b>Full Name</b>	Matthew and Kathryn Gorman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation.</p> <p>To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8104
<b>Person ID</b>	1266061
<b>Full Name</b>	Nick Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response I request that you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>To highlight one point, the development proposed will overwhelm Berkhamsted and the proposed developments on the ridge south of the town will produce a number of vehicle movements which will lead to perpetual congestion and pollution on the few steep roads leading down into the town. It will also lead to urbanisation and effective destruction of the green spaces provided by woods such as Hockeridge Wood and Pancake Wood to the south of the A41 bypass which are enormously important to the health and well being of the town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8107
<b>Person ID</b>	1266064
<b>Full Name</b>	Melissa Snowden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name - Melissa Snowden

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8108

**Person ID** 1266065

**Full Name** Stephen Bevan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation.

To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8109

**Person ID** 1144676

**Full Name** Mrs Karen Bevan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>I strongly object to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth, the plan is for too many of the wrong houses in the wrong places.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8113
<b>Person ID</b>	1266067
<b>Full Name</b>	Grace Phipps
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request that you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAGs responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8115

<b>Person ID</b>	1266069
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephanie Mitchell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8118
<b>Person ID</b>	1266072
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicky Gaitskell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please don't do this to our beautiful town. Over the last year during the country's coronavirus battle it has become apparent how much we need our green spaces for our mental and physical health. We have discovered so many interesting places by walking and exploring our town over the last year.</p> <p>To build even more houses in an already built up town will be at an irrevocable cost to our town. We will never be able to recover the green spaces which will be lost. The overcrowding of an already highly populated town will lead to even more infrastructure issues which we already experience such as a lack of school spaces, hard to get doctors and dental appointments, overcrowded trains, parking problems in residential streets to name a few.</p> <p>Please don't subject our town to such an unnecessary poorly thought out plan.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8121
<b>Person ID</b>	1266074
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Honour
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8122
<b>Person ID</b>	1266075

<b>Full Name</b>	Dawn Wylie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>This poorly thought out plan seems to be ideologically geared towards maximum profit for developers and the impact on berkhamsted itself will be considerable. Your response system is archaic, difficult to navigate and one can only assume that thus is a deliberate attempt to obfuscate matters and to make it harder for legitimate queries and critiques to be registered.</p> <p>With thanks in advance for your consideration.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8125
<b>Person ID</b>	1266079
<b>Full Name</b>	Emily Barlow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to you in respect of the Council's Local Plan to 2038.</p> <p>I disagree with this Local Plan and the housing number proposed. The roads are already overused, in disrepair and out of lockdown, there are significant queues along Shootersway to join the A41 towards Hemel Hempstead. Any further significant traffic and my sons and I will struggle to SAFELY cross Shootersway to get to their schools.</p> <p>The environment and local ecology will also be impacted. Our countryside is so important to our health and wellbeing.</p> <p>In summary, I am against this Local Plan. 830 houses will mean at least 1,500 cars (as most households have on average two cars) and the local area can NOT cope with this additional demand.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8126
<b>Person ID</b>	1266080
<b>Full Name</b>	Ed Peachey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8133
<b>Person ID</b>	1266082
<b>Full Name</b>	Paula Williamson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8141
<b>Person ID</b>	1266085
<b>Full Name</b>	Sue Dyson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object strenuously to the proposed development plan; far too many houses with no consideration on the local community! Have any of you tried to park in Berkhamsted??? Ridiculous.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8144
<b>Person ID</b>	1266087
<b>Full Name</b>	Ross Hughes

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a resident of Northchurch, adjacent to Berkhamsted I am very concerned about the negative impact of this plan on the green belt and local towns. Berkhamsted has been described by many as a jewel of the Chilterns, but the dramatic increase in the number of houses, and therefore increase in the population, will quite frankly ruin the character of this picturesque, historic market town. We are merely custodians of the land, and I believe that towns such as Berkhamsted, and the surrounding green belt should be maintained for future generations to enjoy as we have been fortunate to enjoy ourselves.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8145
<b>Person ID</b>	772055
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Nicola Menzies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8146
<b>Person ID</b>	1266088
<b>Full Name</b>	Scott Menzies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8147
<b>Person ID</b>	1266089
<b>Full Name</b>	Anna Hill
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p> <p>Please note every single resident of Berkhamsted and surrounding areas I have spoken with is outraged at these proposals. It is imperative that a proper consultation of the people who are affected – i.e. the residents – is undertaken before any next steps are agreed.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8149
<b>Person ID</b>	1266090
<b>Full Name</b>	Amy and Andrew Cooper
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8153
<b>Person ID</b>	1266095
<b>Full Name</b>	George Watson

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm a resident of Northchurch, which for some reason is repeatedly referred to as 'West Berkhamsted' in the Plan. I'm immediately wary of a document that doesn't use the correct name for the area. Northchurch is not a suburb of Berkhamsted - it has its own character, and in fact predates its larger neighbour by hundreds of years.</p> <p>The first objection that I'd like to make is a personal one. Over the past few months, owing to the COVID-19 situation, I have been working from home. During this very stressful period, the presence of green fields and wonderful views have kept me sane, (relatively) anchored and a lot happier than I would otherwise have been. I'm sure that there are many other people who feel the same way. At the moment, looking at the proposed development sites, the view from my windows would be affected, as would be the area around the Grand Union Canal. The most unacceptable intrusion would be the negative impact on Northchurch Common. Any sense of peace or connection to nature would be irrevocably damaged by the looming presence of large amounts of new housing.</p> <p>The next point I would like to raise is the sheer number of new houses proposed in the plan. According to my reading of your documents, I'm in complete agreement with CPRE's assessment that the numbers have been calculated using the wrong data set. I would venture that you should recalculate the level of need with something more recent than the 2014 data collated by the ONS. Am I right in thinking that there is a more recent data set (I've heard that there may be some collected in 2018) that could be applied to whatever algorithm you have employed?</p> <p>The proposed new housing in West Berkhamsted (Northchurch!!!) will have a massive impact on the village in a number of different ways. I can see the population of Northchurch doubling in a very short space of time. I can't see that any serious consideration has been made to what might happen in the wake of such a drastic change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on existing amenities. The pressure on St. Mary's Primary school, access to doctors and dentists will be extreme. There is little enough parking in Northchurch, particularly around the shops on the High Street (Sunday is particularly chaotic in the area around Tesco), that I fear the streets will become jammed. Pre-COVID, I commuted each day into London on the train. Bearing in mind the nature of Northchurch and Berkhamsted's population, it's very likely there will be even more pressure on the already creaky route into Euston.</li> <li>• The environmental impact. Realistically, each new household will add at least one, more likely two new cars to already overcrowded roads in the area. Northchurch High Street already has an air pollution problem, with levels far above what's viewed as acceptable. The children at St. Mary's school are already breathing unacceptably dirty air - we shouldn't be adding to the problem.</li> </ul>

- Drainage issues. There seems to be no serious proposals to address drainage issues in the Plan. Northchurch's water and sewage system is already creaky, but this appears to have been ignored. What will the effect be of concreting over open space on hillsides, now that we know the climate is going to be a lot wetter in the near future? Living at the bottom of the valley, I don't want to be flooded out, simply because nobody has properly thought through the consequences of their actions. There is a high likelihood that there may be damage to the River Bulbourne by run-off and escaped sewage. The Bulbourne is a uniquely fragile part of the local ecosystem. Pristine chalk streams are increasingly rare and need to be protected at all times - they shouldn't be damaged or destroyed due to vague, generalised proposals.

There seems to have been no serious exploration of brownfield sites in the Plan, of which there are many good options in the borough. Isn't that the government's preferred location for new developments? A more suspicious person than I might conclude that the desirability/larger profit margin for developers building on newly declassified green belt sites might have played a small part in the selection of the proposed locations over brownfields

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns. All I want out of life is that my wife my two children and I can continue to enjoy the lovely place where we live, free of fear of flooding, increased air pollution and environmental degradation, to be able to use local amenities that aren't creaking at the seams and at the point of collapse, and to be able to enjoy the beautiful countryside around us.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8155

**Person ID** 1266097

**Full Name** Gemma Ayres

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have lived in Northchurch my whole life and am horrified and heartbroken by these proposals. Northchurch has been referred to as 'West Berkhamsted' in the plan, as though my village is to be obliterated and subsumed by the larger town we are connected to. I care deeply about Berkhamsted as well as Northchurch, but this village has its own identity and community and we cannot let that be destroyed. The new plan shows no respect to a thriving village, its history or community in any way.

I am also deeply concerned by the proposals to build on Green Belt Land. Green Belt Land should be protected - it is highly valued currently by locals and should be preserved for future generations. The field between Darrs Lane and Durrants Lane is one I pass every day on my way to work. It is a beautiful view and walking spot for those that live nearby and I enjoy seeing it as I drive to work. I do not enjoy seeing the monstrosity that is the new housing development further along the road. Where once I saw fields, now I see nothing but soulless houses. The thought of this happening to more areas in Northchurch and Berkhamsted is devastating to locals. We chose to live here for many reasons and the surrounding fields and countryside views are a key part of that. I cannot see any justification for building on Green Belt land - to do so completely disregards the whole purpose of having Green Belt land in the first place, which is that it can be protected against developments such as this.

I dread to think how much busier Northchurch and Berkhamsted will be if this proposal were to go ahead; how much more congestion and pollution there will be from more cars on the road, how much busier car parks will be not to mention additional strain on services such as doctors, dentists etc.

I am also very concerned that more people do not know about these proposals and have not been able to register their objections. Lack of objections cannot be taken as support - I cannot imagine local residents supporting this plan. I feel that many simply have not been well enough informed or given the opportunity to raise their objections.

I have always considered myself lucky to live in an area like the Chilterns, an AONB, and in Northchurch in particular. I cannot bear the thought of more of this beautiful area being destroyed by housing developments and hope you will give due considerations to all the objections raised so that we can protect and preserve this wonderful area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8167

**Person ID** 1266113

**Full Name** Michaela Foster-Osborne

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.

Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.

This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8177
<b>Person ID</b>	1266121
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Asher-Relf
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8179
<b>Person ID</b>	222113
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my disapproval with the proposals for the local plan. Whilst I accept housing is needed, the sheer scale of the proposed building plan seems to ignore existing local communities.</p> <p>A town's identity is important and towns such as Berkhamsted should not be built around to such an extent they blur into the next built up area. Green belt serves a useful and ever more important purpose, not only to provide a place to relax and experience nature, but to assist with the climate emergency.</p> <p>This plan fails to address the sustainable and green agenda, when this has to be at the very heart of everything we do.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider: drastically reduce the scale of any building and to hugely enhance the green credentials of this and any future development proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8180
<b>Person ID</b>	222113
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8186
<b>Person ID</b>	1266124
<b>Full Name</b>	Louise Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8195
<b>Person ID</b>	1266126
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane and James Stewart
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am extremely concerned by the plan to build so many extra houses in and around Berkhamsted in the near future. Our green spaces should be preserved for our environment and wildlife. Once you build on a green field you can never unbuild.</p> <p>Berkhamsted struggles with traffic right now in our already crowded valley. How can it possibly cope with the traffic from 1000's more houses? The pollution is dangerous for our children's health, as is the traffic itself as they try to cross the road. Noise pollution from extra traffic is a concern as well as the noxious fumes spewed out by cars.</p> <p>How can the infrastructure of the town cope with more people? The schools are already full. The GP surgeries and other medical facilities are already struggling to cope with the current population in town. Trains in non-covid times are full to bursting with commuters.</p> <p>I am concerned that already the industrial estate is going to be removed and replaced with housing. Where are the people that currently work there and provide useful services to the town going to work/provide those services? Somewhere out of town, creating more traffic?</p> <p>Our very way of life is at stake. Please do not build this level of housing.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8202
<b>Person ID</b>	1266150
<b>Full Name</b>	Michela Capozzi
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>1 Developments in Northchurch, Berkhamsted and Tring</b></p> <p>Whilst I am a resident of Northchurch I also feel very strongly against the proposals for the developments in Berkhamsted and Tring. Not only will the developments proposed in Berkhamsted and Tring be detrimental to the residents of the towns but also to the residents of Northchurch. Located between the two towns, Northchurch will, undoubtedly, be impacted by additional traffic along the A4251 as people travel between the two and don't use the by-pass as getting on and off it will take them additional time.</p>

Also, neither Tring nor Berkhamsted have the infrastructure to cope with the additional population demand these developments would bring. It is claimed that Berkhamsted town centre would serve the new developments and cites the new car park as aiding the additional traffic into the town. The new car park was built to alleviate the terrible parking issues the town has and has not been built to future-proof for additional development. Additionally, despite claims to ensure accessibility to the train stations and shops etc all developments in both Tring and Berkhamsted will result in more traffic on the already congested roads as the distance from amenities will mean walking will not be an option and any bus service will never support the flexibility people will expect.

Turning now to the proposed developments in and around Northchurch, the first thing I would say is DBC has failed to recognise the village of Northchurch and its unique character. DBC seem to think it is an extension of Berkhamsted and can be covered by the plans for Berkhamsted. This is very wrong. Northchurch is a village with its own character and history. Part of that character is the surrounding green belt and Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The importance of maintaining this land in its natural condition on the local ecology and well-being of local residents has been pushed aside by DBC. Destroying this beautiful countryside would take away everything that makes Northchurch what is it and why people chose to live here.

The roads in and around Northchurch and in particular, where the developments are proposed, are not suitable for the additional traffic the developments will bring. There are numerous single-lane sections to the roads in Northchurch and road-widening is not possible. This is certainly the case near the proposed Lock Field development on New Road where the bridge crosses the canal and Darrs Lane is also single-width with few passing points.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8205
<b>Person ID</b>	490158
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Alison Lascelles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8206

**Person ID** 1266151

**Full Name** Robert Lascelles

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8207

**Person ID** 1266152

**Full Name** James Honour

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I fully support the objections that Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) have raised with you.</p> <p>With greedy faceless developers from across the UK wanting to build a huge and unprecedented number houses smothering Berkhamsted from Bourne End across to Tring, I would also like to add my own thoughts starting with Sir David Attenborough. In his address to the members of the United Security on 23rd February 2021, he said: <i>'If we continue on our current path, we will face the collapse of everything that gives us our security. Food production. Access to fresh water. Habitable ambient temperature and ocean food chains.'</i></p> <p>He also made a plea: <i>'Please make no mistake, Climate Change is the biggest threat to security that modern humans have ever faced. I don't envy you the responsibility that this places on all of you and your governments.'</i></p> <p>I suggest these key factors against such unwelcome and outrageous proposals:</p> <p><b>1 - Overdevelopment</b> has already been imposed on Berkhamsted and Northchurch over past decades. We have already done our bit. Any more would simply be excessive and out of scale. Additionally, with the UK hosting COP26 in Glasgow later this year, it would be an embarrassment. This 1960s attitude of still building on fertile agricultural land really has to stop. There are no excuses for it anymore.</p> <p><b>2 - Food security</b> is the elephant in the room. We need food much more than housing in the country now. COVID briefly showed us how scary food shortages can be and how quickly they happen. It will be far worse in the near future with extreme weather patterns making crop production more risky, as last summer proved. It would be very short-sighted to sacrifice farmland these days, knowing full well that Climate Change is well under way.</p> <p><b>3 – The Victorian infrastructure</b> of Berkhamsted's roads, drainage and buildings is already creaking with current levels of population and pollution.</p> <p><b>4 - Wildlife</b> - Biodiversity will be given yet another blow as the bulldozers and concrete mixers move in turning our ancient countryside that took millions of years to be created destroy yet more fields, hedges and trees. As Sir David said in that address, <i>'moral responsibility that wealthy nations have to the rest of the world and put a value on nature that goes far beyond money.'</i></p> <p><b>5 - Finite resources</b> – Large scale construction projects consume massive quantities of the Earth's raw materials. That is simply not sustainable anymore.</p> <p><b>6 - Quality of life</b> - Mental health (depression) of Berkhamsted residents would be affected by such proposals. People can sense that this is way out of scale for the town and surrounding area.</p> <p><b>7 - Protected status</b> – The planning process should be protecting the Green Belt, this Area of Outstanding Beauty, this historic market town and our green and pleasant land. People gave their lives in two world wars to protect this.</p>

**8 - Urban heat island effect** – If these proposals were built, the town would contribute significantly to overheating (can be up to 10 degrees Celsius higher), with so much more additional manmade materials laid out across the land. The fields and wood around our town help us to avoid overheating in summer.

Please consider our primary school children, our successors, who are fully aware of the dangers and implications of Climate Change.

I have lived in Berkhamsted since 1967 and sadly, it has been largely ruined by over-development since then. It is no coincidence, that numbers of wildlife species have plummeted during that time.

I have friends who have already moved far away from Berkhamsted and some abroad to escape the continuous squeezing of houses into what were previously gardens because they felt strongly that the planning system had failed them and the town. All the empty overgrown plots that I played in as a child have certainly long gone and their wildlife with it.

I ask you to make your decisions seriously and carefully and consider what Sir David Attenborough would think, with his stark warning to the United Nations in mind.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8208

**Person ID** 1266153

**Full Name** James Samuel

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8230
<b>Person ID</b>	1266154
<b>Full Name</b>	Iain Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23): Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. <b>The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</b>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8231
<b>Person ID</b>	1266154
<b>Full Name</b>	Iain Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(24): This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8240
<b>Person ID</b>	1266155
<b>Full Name</b>	Annabel Carroll
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p> <p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution</p>

as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8253

**Person ID** 1266158

**Full Name** Mr and Mrs Karl and Mikaela Morgan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum. This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8266

**Person ID** 1266163

**Full Name** Phillip Brown

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have a number of concerns about these proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 16,500 new homes to be built. Berkhamsted is a market town with a narrow high street. This number of houses is a lot more than was proposed in 2013 and will completely block the high street with traffic. If there is a problem on the A41, traffic already ends up coming through the centre of Berkhamsted. This sad fact will be intensified by the proposed building. This number of houses is undoubtedly nothing more than profit driven.</li> <li>2 What evidence is there for sustainability and respect of the environment?</li> <li>3 There is no reason to be building on Green Belt land - the “exceptional circumstances” required to do so are not there. Using brown belt and urban sites must be a priority. I don’t see evidence of this.</li> <li>4 Much is made of affordable housing - what does this mean? How realistic is it that 40% of housing will be affordable?</li> <li>5 Berkhamsted is now considered to be one of the nicest places to live in the UK. These proposals will destroy the heart of this town which will become overcrowded and sprawling.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8267
<b>Person ID</b>	1266164
<b>Full Name</b>	John and Sarah Reynolds-Kettlewell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8304

**Person ID** 1153103

**Full Name** Angela Walsh

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am a long standing Berkhamsted resident.

I have read and agree with the response made by Berkhamsted Citizens Association to the draft reg 18 plan and thus OBJECT to this plan.

As Berkhamsted residents, our principal concerns are:

- 1 We do not think that the necessary infrastructure will, in practice, be able to be built to service the proposed increase of dwellings. Current legislation, economics and the particular geography of Berkhamsted do not seem capable of achieving this.
- 2 The plan appears to be based on earlier predications of population growth which are roughly twice what is now expected. The effects of Brexit, Covid 19 and a shift of Government emphasis to the north of England should be considered.
- 3 Expanding the town will lead to further congestion as people in outlying parts will need to drive into the town centre. Even electric vehicles have a significant environmental impact when 'cradle to grave' issues are taken into consideration. Congestion and infrastructure are already at bursting point and insufficient for the current load.
- 4 Covid has highlighted the need for towns and cities to have green areas for physical and mental well being of citizens and thus the vital importance of preserving green belts.

The plan shows green belt areas removed for (unnecessary) (over) development.

I hope that the considerations of the many many people of Berkhamsted, Tring, Northchurch and Hemel who are against the proposed local plan, will be listened to and heard - and taken into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8305

**Person ID** 1266174

**Full Name** Francisca Cerda Maira

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8313

**Person ID** 1266175

**Full Name** Anna Foster

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am also greatly concerned about the huge proposals in other parts of Berkhamsted, and Tring – it will totally ruin both of the market towns, and the traffic on the route between the two will be untenable. I regularly walk my children to Northchurch recreation ground which involves crossing the main road, which is already quite terrifying, let alone with so much more traffic added.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8333
<b>Person ID</b>	1266194
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael Bromberg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a local citizen, (ADDRESS REDACTED), I appreciate the need for continued growth of housing in Dacorum but object to the above plans on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 The numbers involved seem greater than government requirement. Increasing the size of Berkhamsted and Northchurch by 24% and Tring 51% would completely change the character of these historic market towns. The impact of the pandemic will need evaluation with possible change of use of retail as business properties to residential. There is also the impact of Brexit to consider with fewer people from the EU choosing to make Britain their home.</p> <p>2 The Green Belt is vital and should be preserved. Covid19 has shown how important it is for both exercise and mental health. There would be a huge impact on the environment particularly alongside the canal in Northchurch.</p> <p>3 The impact on the water supply would be detrimental in this area of chalk streams.</p>

4 The infrastructure can barely cope now let alone with such a massive increase in population. More doctors, dentists, schools etc would be necessary and the transport system hugely increased.

5 The long narrow shape of Berkhamsted within the valley would be compromised .

I hope this plan will be critically reviewed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8349

**Person ID** 1266201

**Full Name** Maggie Procopi

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to register my concerns regarding the Dacorum Borough Council Emerging Strategy for Growth.  
I am strongly opposed to further housing development and expansion of the town of Berkhamsted and the surrounding areas.

The plan proposes building on Green Belt land which is unacceptable. This will have a negative impact on our existing environment, wildlife, chalk streams etc, not to mention the knock-on effects of air pollution from increased traffic.

Any reasonable person would agree that it makes sound environmental sense to concentrate on developing brownfield sites, rather than build on Green Belt land that was set aside for a very good reason.

I believe also that it would be wise to reconsider the Plan in the light of Post Covid years ahead. It is very likely we will have to endure further pandemics and as such forward thinking planners are already considering the changes that are needed and the opportunities that are emerging with regard to the commute to London and that London itself may be

ripe for rejuvenation, becoming a place where people live and work, rather than commute into from outside. In future it is highly likely that there will be less desire and indeed requirement for people to live within commuting distance of London. Satellite offices, local co-working centres, remote and agile working will take the place of the 5 day week, 9-5 regime. As such developers may be better advised to take their money elsewhere and look to rejuvenate neglected towns and cities outside of the south east.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8367

**Person ID** 1266204

**Full Name** Chris O'Driscoll

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8373

**Person ID** 1266207

**Full Name** Elitta O'Driscoll

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8381
<b>Person ID</b>	1266212
<b>Full Name</b>	FIONA THOMPSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8384
<b>Person ID</b>	1266214
<b>Full Name</b>	CINDY AND CRAIG GIBSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8386
<b>Person ID</b>	399112
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sally Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	INFRASTRUCTURE

This is a huge potential problem for the both the Dacorum community and Council Services alike. Over the years I have seen the population of Berkhamsted increase dramatically with new estates, infill projects etc with the following consequences:

- . Severe congestion in the town with the associated degradation in air quality.
- . Overcrowded doctors surgeries and lack of resource for social/ mental healthcare for many who do not have the financial resources to use private facilities
- . Overcrowded schools with parents having to fight for places for their children in schools that can provide them with competent education for the future.
- . Severe pressure of utilities especially water which we have seen in recent years ,even with the existing population levels , become a problem.
- . Increases in noise, poor air quality ,litter and for some, anti- social behaviour.

The proposed development will have a major impact on the quality and pleasure of living and visiting the area. It has to be scaled back and supported with immediate commensurate infrastructure enhancements. Our local politicians have to deliver an unequivocal message to Central Government hat Dacorum cannot and will not be able to deliver reasonable, good quality , sustainable growth without the upfront infrastructure development in place from day one. Failure to do this will result in intense frustration for all the residents of Dacorum and will be reflected in future voting decisions.

In conclusion I have no fundamental objection to reasonable additional housing, especially affordable, for those that need it. However any development has to be a programme that reflects the local communities immediate and longer term needs whilst maintaining quality lifestyles for all and not a housing numbers game.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8387
<b>Person ID</b>	1266215
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRISTOPHER WOODMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
<b>* Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please accept this email as confirmation of my support for the full and considered response already submitted by The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group to the Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038 Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. I confirm that I wish DBC to duplicate The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group's response in my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8388
<b>Person ID</b>	1266216
<b>Full Name</b>	Debby Coles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum. This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8389
<b>Person ID</b>	1266217
<b>Full Name</b>	KATHARINE ANDREWS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8394
<b>Person ID</b>	1266224
<b>Full Name</b>	RALPH NETHERCOAT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8396
<b>Person ID</b>	1159212
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Dann
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8397
<b>Person ID</b>	1266226
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE NETHERCOAT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8398
<b>Person ID</b>	1266227
<b>Full Name</b>	HARRY NETHERCOAT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8403
<b>Person ID</b>	404933

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr George Luff
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>How does Northchurch relate to:</b></p> <p><i>'The Countryside and other small villages will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>be protected from development; and</i></li> <li>• <i>have diversified further to support changing rural and agricultural practices.'</i>? <p>and to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <i>to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;</i></li> <li>2 <i>to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;</i></li> <li>3 <i>to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</i></li> <li>4 <i>to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and</i></li> <li>5 <i>to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</i></li> </ol> </li></ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8410
<b>Person ID</b>	406556
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Christopher Pickup
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we kindly request that you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8413
<b>Person ID</b>	1266234
<b>Full Name</b>	LUCY DUGDALE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>&gt; —The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p> <p>&gt; — Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>&gt; — The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>&gt; —There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p>

> —Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

> —There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

> —This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8417
<b>Person ID</b>	1266235
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Pickup
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we kindly request that you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8421

<b>Person ID</b>	1266237
<b>Full Name</b>	KEITH FARQUHARSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8422
<b>Person ID</b>	1144962
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Katherine Cummins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p>

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8424

**Person ID** 1266239

**Full Name** JULIAN ORMEROD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I am writing to inform you that I oppose the proposed development around Berkhamsted. It is over-development on beautiful green belt. It also fails to address infrastructure to support the proposed growth.  
I do not support the proposal.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8427

**Person ID** 1264932

**Full Name** H Harker

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to say that I disagree with the Local Plan and housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>The housing numbers in the Local Plan across Berkhamsted are excessive and wrong. The impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate and does not consider existing and recent major developments in the area (Bearroc) and severely impacts infrastructure (roads schools and utilities) congestion, road safety, local ecology, health and wellbeing.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8434
<b>Person ID</b>	1145483
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Elisabeth Young
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8435
<b>Person ID</b>	1266246
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE GALVIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8436
<b>Person ID</b>	1266249
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8437
<b>Person ID</b>	1266250
<b>Full Name</b>	JENNIFER HART
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a local citizen, I appreciate the need for continued growth of housing in Dacorum but object to the above plans on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 The numbers involved seem greater than government requirement. Increasing size of Berkhamsted and Northchurch by 24% and Tring 51% would completely change the character of these historic market towns. The impact of the pandemic will need evaluation with possible change of use of retail as business properties to residential. There is also the impact of Brexit to consider with fewer people from EU chosen to make Britain their home.</p> <p>2 The Green Belt should be preserved. Covid19 has shown how vital it is for both exercise and mental health. There would be a huge impact on the environment particularly alongside the canal in Northchurch.</p> <p>3 The impact on the water supply would be detrimental in this area of chalk streams.</p> <p>4 The infrastructure can barely cope now let alone with such a massive increase in population. Doctors, dentists schools etc plus the transport system would need to be hugely increased.</p> <p>5 The long narrow shape of Berkhamsted within the valley would be compromised .</p>

I hope this plan will be reviewed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8440

**Person ID** 1266251

**Full Name** ANTHONY TYRER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Greenbelt

All the development is on Greenbelt. The land between Shootersway and the A41 is considered of poorer quality, but it has always been regarded as Berkhamsted's "Green Lung" absorbing emissions from the A41.

4 Housing distribution

Berkhamsted is set to grow by 25% but there is no consideration to constraints within the town (congestion, lack of public transport, lack of safe cycle ways etc).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8443

**Person ID** 1266275

**Full Name** GRANT CHAMBERLAIN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There are far too many houses and not enough infrastructure in Berkhamsted town already, let alone with another 25% increase, there is one main road and it's already congested now . The schools are already at full capacity . It's a small market town and it would be a shame to spoil it with so many people .
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8455
<b>Person ID</b>	1266282
<b>Full Name</b>	Kate Turnbull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. BRAG has responded in full to the consultation and I request you to accept this as confirmation that I wish DPC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8456
<b>Person ID</b>	1266283
<b>Full Name</b>	David Turnbull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. BRAG has responded in full to the consultation and I request you to accept this as confirmation that I wish DPC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8460
<b>Person ID</b>	1266287
<b>Full Name</b>	NICOLA SKERM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8461
<b>Person ID</b>	1266288

<b>Full Name</b>	PAUL SKERM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8471
<b>Person ID</b>	495878
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Anna Hanson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Further to my earlier comments regarding traffic:</p> <p>The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.</p>

This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.

The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8473

**Person ID** 495878

**Full Name** Ms Anna Hanson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their

Self assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8482

**Person ID** 1266302

**Full Name** Gareth Garner

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plan do not take into consideration the increase in traffic in Berkhamsted caused by movement of new residents as most of the developments will require car travel as they are on the edge of town. The valley shape of the town funnels all vehicles into a few central smaller roads to access all shops, train station and services. Private cars are the only means of transport as cycling is not practical for families where younger children struggle to manage the hills. The town will become unsafe for children who are currently able to walk to their local school in terms of car accident risk and the associated pollution.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8501
<b>Person ID</b>	406485
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jayne Beckett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are writing to say that we disagree totally with the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) for the following reasons. The housing numbers are disproportionately large – why do they greatly exceed the housing needs forecast calculated by no less than the ONS. There is no mention of affordable housing which is desperately needed in Berkhamsted. It will lead to an increase in road congestion – the latest Bearroc development has increased traffic to a large degree along Shootersway and as the footpath – on one side only – is not maintained properly it has become very dangerous for parents with young children walking near to a traffic heavy road.

The increase caused by the housing of population would adversely affect local infrastructure, schools, doctors and dentists are all over subscribed and there is no or little public transport around the town, only through the centre.

We are totally against building on the Green Belt, which was created to stop urban sprawl – which is exactly what is proposed in this plan – ribbon development at its worst.

Around here, the Green Belt abuts the Chilterns and as it was suggested a little while ago that the Chilterns be made a National Park which would explain this rush to build as it would not be allowed next to a National Park, if it was farmed.

This last year has demonstrated very clearly how important green spaces are for the populace. It has been acknowledged for some time that Berkhamsted is officially short of these – and this plan will decimate those spaces around the town.

In other words this Local Plan fails on all fronts.

It will adversely affect all Berkhamsted be it road congestion and the concomitant air pollution, lack of access to green space, local ecology and stress on the infrastructure.

These very same objections were raised prior to the Bearroc development and the adverse consequences predicted have occurred eg traffic increase, environmental degradation (loss of wildlife) and lack of increased local provision promised

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8507
<b>Person ID</b>	223896
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Beckett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are writing to say that we disagree totally with the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) for the following reasons. The housing numbers are disproportionately large – why do they greatly exceed the housing needs forecast calculated by no less than the ONS. There is no mention of affordable housing which is desperately needed in Berkhamsted.

It will lead to an increase in road congestion – the latest Bearroc development has increased traffic to a large degree along Shootersway and as the footpath – on one side only – is not maintained properly it has become very dangerous for parents with young children walking near to a traffic heavy road.

The increase caused by the housing of population would adversely affect local infrastructure, schools, doctors and dentists are all over subscribed and there is no or little public transport around the town, only through the centre.

We are totally against building on the Green Belt, which was created to stop urban sprawl – which is exactly what is proposed in this plan – ribbon development at its worst.

Around here, the Green Belt abuts the Chilterns and as it was suggested a little while ago that the Chilterns be made a National Park which would explain this rush to build as it would not be allowed next to a National Park, if it was farmed.

This last year has demonstrated very clearly how important green spaces are for the populace. It has been acknowledged for some time that Berkhamsted is officially short of these – and this plan will decimate those spaces around the town.

In other words this Local Plan fails on all fronts.

It will adversely affect all Berkhamsted be it road congestion and the concomitant air pollution, lack of access to green space, local ecology and stress on the infrastructure.

These very same objections were raised prior to the Bearroc development and the adverse consequences predicted have occurred eg traffic increase, environmental degradation (loss of wildlife) and lack of increased local provision promised

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8520

**Person ID** 405224

**Full Name** Mrs Jennifer R Honour

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I write to record my objection to the above plan for the following reasons

- Berkhamsted has been one continuous development for many years.

- This has caused great strain on all our local services.
- This has caused increased congestion on all local roads despite mitigating alternations to the High Street and other roads when the A41 bypass was built.
- Continued procrastination about the need or location of a new hospital, the present travel time to Watford is unacceptable and horrendous.
- A majority of proposed development is next to the A41 where air quality and noise pollution would make living there undesirable.
- Stop destroying our once peaceful market town

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8522

**Person ID** 1161179

**Full Name** David Kerrigan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

These proposals amount to an unnecessary and unjustifiable move to deprive the district of Dacorum, and particularly the town of Berkhamsted, of Green Belt land as part of a strategy to build more homes than are needed. As such it is sheer folly, on several levels.

- Housing need is estimated on out-of-date information and using inadequate methodology, resulting in inflated targets. Latest evidence shows a reduced housing need, even before any post-Covid 19 effects are included.
- The burden on Berkhamsted is grossly disproportionate compared with other development centres in the district – a 35% hike in new homes
- The proposed threat to Green Belt land can only be judged as wanton in view of the fact there would be no need to use Green Belt land at all if estimates of future homes needed were realistic.
- National government has made it clear that only in exceptional circumstances should Green Belt land be released, and then only on a very limited scale, and with the approval of the local population – an approval they would not give any more than turkeys would vote for Christmas.



- The string of developments all along the southern border of Berkhamsted would provide further encouragement to ribbon development along the A41, threatening a future merging of Berkhamsted and Hemel.
- At the same time local infrastructure and services of all kinds in Berkhamsted would be put under intense pressure, as next to nothing is envisaged as being provided within the new communities.

I fully support the detailed response made to yourselves by Berkhamsted Town Council.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8532

**Person ID** 1264961

**Full Name** Javid Khan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please find below my reasons for objections to the local DBC plan.

**Health and well-being are paramount to our communities. This Local Plan, if anything, will make life worse for those already living here and offer a congested, polluted, market town, stretched beyond its limits, to anyone thinking of moving here.**

**Infrastructure**

- The transport study takes *no* account of Berkhamsted’s geography and valley setting. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.
- *No* significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.
- No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes.
- No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)
- The ‘wildlife corridors’ are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don’t connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.

## Housing numbers

- 24% increase in housing proposed in Berkhamsted (more than 900 houses) 50% increase proposed in Tring
- Council using outdated (2014) housing projections. Half of this number needed in reality (using more recent ONS data from 2018).
- DBC *should* challenge the proposed housing numbers – which are dictated by central Government, rather than just accept them.

## Housing distribution

- Hemel, Berkhamsted and Tring are all expected to take their ‘fair share’ of housing proposed. Each of these settlements have their own issues and constraints (topography-how hilly it is/valley, congestions, lack of public transport, lack of safe cycle ways, etc.) However, DBC seems to just be looking at the numbers – and not taking these vital issues into account.

## Water

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It’s not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested.

## Greenbelt

- Nearly all development proposed will be on Greenbelt. – this is *against* Government policy.
- The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. *A green buffer is needed.*
- They should look at further Brownfield sites – as they are required to do.

## Sustainability

- This is nonsense. Berkhamsted is seen as ‘sustainable’ because it has (some) good facilities, despite the many constraints (hilly, congested main route through valley floor.) Most of the proposed building is at the top of the hill, where most people will rely on their cars for travel in and out of town. There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted’s traffic situation.

## Pollution

- Last but not least...Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Our town lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area.
- I would strongly argue that the proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.
- DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. *Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.*

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8535
<b>Person ID</b>	1266478
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN ABERCROMBY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted. This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.</p> <p>— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field' This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve. Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.</p> <p>— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian</p>

traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary’s Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely

— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo- Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan To subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

- There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion,
- further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne
- reduced water pressure
- there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8552

**Person ID** 211354

**Full Name** Mrs Laura Sanderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I quote from BRAG’s excellent summary “Policy SP1 really isn’t worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Masterplans to the detriment of both the development and community , while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as “successful new communities”, “best approach to”, “best practice”, “comprehensive green infrastructure”, “multifunctional space”, “an exemplar in sustainable living” etc. etc. etc. BRAG particularly takes issue with “5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy.” As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted,

while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport.”

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8559

**Person ID** 1266560

**Full Name** MRS LINDA BRISCOE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8560

**Person ID** 1266561

**Full Name** PATRICK BENYON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this e mail as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan ( 2020 - 2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group ( BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish Dacorum Borough Council duplicate BRAGS responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8563
<b>Person ID</b>	1266563
<b>Full Name</b>	CHARLOTTE GREENLAND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to express my concern over the local plan for Dacorum as I have noted the proposed loss of green belt land around Berkhamsted, which provides so much amenity value to the town. In a post Covid-19 world it is likely that there will be far less pressure for new housing in places like Dacorum and in Berkhamsted in particular, a traditional place to live for commuting to London, as people move towards more home and remote working. Furthermore it is likely that space that is currently used for businesses in and around Berkhamsted High Street will become vacant as more people shop online and more businesses no longer need office space, and I think these facts should be considered in the plan for future housing development.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8578
<b>Person ID</b>	1266567
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE SMALES

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8582
<b>Person ID</b>	1266570
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRIS WILLIAMS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8583
<b>Person ID</b>	1266572
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE BANNISTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a principle, I do not agree with the development of green belt for any purpose. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8584
<b>Person ID</b>	1266573
<b>Full Name</b>	DIANA WETHERELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wish to oppose the current plans to build thousands of houses in my town Berkhamsted has not the infrastructure to support this massive expansion.
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8585
<b>Person ID</b>	1266574
<b>Full Name</b>	JASON GRAINGER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I have lived in Berkhamsted all my life and am disgusted to find out what's going on behind our backs! I strongly oppose this and feel very let down that you feel it OK to play and mess with our lives!!!
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8589
<b>Person ID</b>	1266243
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Armond
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8592

**Person ID** 1266582

**Full Name** Mrs Beryl Catesby

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to say how very strongly I object to the proposed extra development in Berkhamstead/ Northchurch. The town of Berkhamstead is already over developed . To add all these extra houses will be quite wrong we have not got the schools ,doctors etc., to take these extra homes all of which will be built to make money for the developers with no worries about the town it's self just the money they will make. We will lose more green land ,more congestion in the already over motorised town.

It cannot be said to strongly how wrong this development will be to the lovely town of Berkhamstead.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8595

**Person ID** 1264378

**Full Name** Nicholas Kurth

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>- Being slightly more parochial, I could find no reference to the need for the expansion of medical and dental facilities in Berkhamsted. The current arrangements are already overstretched and unable to cope.</p> <p>- This is little affordable housing in Berkhamsted and development must be directed towards filling this gap. I was appalled that the new Bearroc Park development provided yet more expensive executive homes. I detect the hand of developers here, seeking increased margins. This must stop in order to meet the requirements of all sections of society.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8603
<b>Person ID</b>	1266588
<b>Full Name</b>	NICK O'REILLY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are writing in response to the current consultation in connection with the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth.</p> <p>We do of course understand the need for more housing and the benefits for employment and investment that derive from building projects. However, we do not believe that Berkhamsted can take the level of development proposed and believe that the benefits would be significantly better distributed in local areas where urban regeneration is desperately needed; where those local areas have capacity for development without causing a devastating impact on the Green Belt and/or the existing population; and where homes built will be genuinely affordable.</p> <p>We do not propose to respond to each, and every section raised within the consultation response – it pre-supposes that we accept that some sort of further development must happen within Berkhamsted. We do not accept that any of the</p>

proposals for development offer a realistic basis for a new and achievable local plan. We have not located any explanation from those involved in this consultation as to the reasons behind why Hemel Hempstead is currently well under the planned development targets so far into the current Core Strategy. It is incumbent upon all those involved in producing a new Local Plan to provide a clear understanding as to why this issue has not been addressed.

The majority of the proposed areas for development in and around Berkhamsted are to be situated on land designated as Green Belt. As stated by you elsewhere, the purpose of this designation is to protect the town it surrounds. In circumstances where Berkhamsted has already been developed above the target set within the current Core Strategy over the last 10-15 years it is wholly unsustainable for further development to take place in the town not least on land designated as Green Belt.

The town's road networks are already under significant pressure and irrespective of initiatives or investment little can realistically be done to relieve this. The LTP4 Travel Plan 2018 makes very little mention of Berkhamsted save in very general terms although we note that despite its hilly characteristics it has been identified as a cycle infrastructure improvement town (see below).

The consultation does emphasise the good transport links that are afforded within Berkhamsted but makes little reference to the fact that the geographic nature of the Town's establishment, nestled towards the bottom of a valley, combined with its Victorian/Edwardian pattern of narrow streets with on street parking on steep hills, makes traffic movement at the best of times very difficult in Berkhamsted. Cycling and walking are probably practical as much here as anywhere, and yet the geography of the Town means that no proposal based upon use of these methods can be heavily relied upon, particularly from the top of the hill at the south edge of the town where the proposed developments are (in the main) to be situated. Even where the hills are not steep, and roads are slightly wider, there is the barrier created by the Grand Union Canal and the West Coast mainline railway and parking associated with those commuters. There is little within the consultation document that acknowledges these issues although the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 (see paras 3.14 and 3.129 in particular) refers to these issues.

Our primary concern is about how development to the south and west of the town will impact on traffic in circumstances where the railway station is on the north side of the town and where there is only one direct road route across the town from south to north. Such development will inevitably cause increased traffic congestion not least when there is a return by commuters to their workplaces post the current Covid-19 pandemic. Any regular commuter will attest to the frequency with which pre Covid-19 they failed to get a seat on the train between London and Berkhamsted and vice versa – more development on the outskirts of the town will not ease the situation for those commuters who are already using what is acknowledged to be the 15th busiest rail station in Hertfordshire. The reference within the consultation document that there is now a multi-storey car park in the town centre does not address the issue that this construction was never intended to support commuters.

What is more, there is only one junction on to the A41 on the south side of Berkhamsted. The Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 (para 3.11) states that there are 'limited access points' from Berkhamsted on to the A41 – there is only one. There is no provision for an additional junction to be built to allow access on to the A41 within the Local Plan. The pressure on the single A41 junction and the surrounding roads (particularly Shootersway at its

junction with Kings Road) with approximately 750 houses anticipated by the Local Plan feeding into it from the south and west side of the town will be colossal.

Leaving aside the issue of building on the Green Belt, whilst the proposals may well be ‘filling in’ current space right up to the edge of the A41 there is no provision for how the excess traffic arising from these developments (plus the second phase of construction at Durrants Lane) will be handled. At a time when pre Covid-19 the morning peak periods causes traffic to back up on Shootersway beyond Barncroft Road on occasion (as people try to go about their daily business and access other areas of the town or get onto the A41) there is no justification within the documentation as to why it is deemed acceptable that more traffic congestion will be created from the proposed housing on the various sites listed within the consultation document or as to what will be done to alleviate it.

As just one of many further examples of the impact of such proposed development on current Berkhamsted residents, Greenway Primary School is situated at the end of Crossways off Shootersway on the same site as St Thomas More RC Primary School and close to many of the proposed development sites. Currently children aged 9 and above in the town are encouraged to walk to school without parents. This had been appropriate given the current traffic levels and the training available to children on pedestrian safety.

Contrary to the assurances given at the time that there would be little impact on traffic along Shootersway, since the first phase of development at Durrants Lane, traffic has already increased enormously along Shootersway particularly in the morning peak periods which causes families/pupils accessing these school sites (and also those walking on to Ashlyns) real concern in using the narrow pavements. These traffic concerns will only escalate with the build of a further 750 plus homes off Shootersway as the homeowners will all need to access Shootersway to enable movement either on to the A41 (via the only available junction) or into the town – there is no other direct route for car users to take.

Shootersway is acknowledged as being a ‘minor route’ within the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 (para 3.13) and is in fact a residential road which has little if no capacity for widening to allow for an increase in traffic caused by development at the sites highlighted within the consultation documentation. Significantly the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 fails to show any photographs of Shootersway even though this is the road that will be used by the homeowners within the proposed developments to the south and west of the town.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8606

**Person ID** 1266585

**Full Name** ELIZABETH O'REILLY MBE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are writing in response to the current consultation in connection with the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth.</p> <p>We do of course understand the need for more housing and the benefits for employment and investment that derive from building projects. However, we do not believe that Berkhamsted can take the level of development proposed and believe that the benefits would be significantly better distributed in local areas where urban regeneration is desperately needed; where those local areas have capacity for development without causing a devastating impact on the Green Belt and/or the existing population; and where homes built will be genuinely affordable.</p> <p>We do not propose to respond to each, and every section raised within the consultation response – it pre-supposes that we accept that some sort of further development must happen within Berkhamsted. We do not accept that any of the proposals for development offer a realistic basis for a new and achievable local plan. We have not located any explanation from those involved in this consultation as to the reasons behind why Hemel Hempstead is currently well under the planned development targets so far into the current Core Strategy. It is incumbent upon all those involved in producing a new Local Plan to provide a clear understanding as to why this issue has not been addressed.</p> <p>The majority of the proposed areas for development in and around Berkhamsted are to be situated on land designated as Green Belt. As stated by you elsewhere, the purpose of this designation is to protect the town it surrounds. In circumstances where Berkhamsted has already been developed above the target set within the current Core Strategy over the last 10-15 years it is wholly unsustainable for further development to take place in the town not least on land designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>The town’s road networks are already under significant pressure and irrespective of initiatives or investment little can realistically be done to relieve this. The LTP4 Travel Plan 2018 makes very little mention of Berkhamsted save in very general terms although we note that despite its hilly characteristics it has been identified as a cycle infrastructure improvement town (see below).</p> <p>The consultation does emphasise the good transport links that are afforded within Berkhamsted but makes little reference to the fact that the geographic nature of the Town’s establishment, nestled towards the bottom of a valley, combined with its Victorian/Edwardian pattern of narrow streets with on street parking on steep hills, makes traffic movement at the best of times very difficult in Berkhamsted. Cycling and walking are probably practical as much here as anywhere, and yet the geography of the Town means that no proposal based upon use of these methods can be heavily relied upon, particularly from the top of the hill at the south edge of the town where the proposed developments are (in the main) to be situated. Even where the hills are not steep, and roads are slightly wider, there is the barrier created by the Grand Union Canal and the West Coast mainline railway and parking associated with those commuters. There is little within the consultation document that acknowledges these issues although the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 (see paras 3.14 and 3.129 in particular) refers to these issues.</p>

Our primary concern is about how development to the south and west of the town will impact on traffic in circumstances where the railway station is on the north side of the town and where there is only one direct road route across the town from south to north. Such development will inevitably cause increased traffic congestion not least when there is a return by commuters to their workplaces post the current Covid-19 pandemic. Any regular commuter will attest to the frequency with which pre Covid-19 they failed to get a seat on the train between London and Berkhamsted and vice versa – more development on the outskirts of the town will not ease the situation for those commuters who are already using what is acknowledged to be the 15th busiest rail station in Hertfordshire. The reference within the consultation document that there is now a multi-storey car park in the town centre does not address the issue that this construction was never intended to support commuters.

What is more, there is only one junction on to the A41 on the south side of Berkhamsted. The Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 (para 3.11) states that there are ‘limited access points’ from Berkhamsted on to the A41 – there is only one. There is no provision for an additional junction to be built to allow access on to the A41 within the Local Plan. The pressure on the single A41 junction and the surrounding roads (particularly Shootersway at its junction with Kings Road) with approximately 750 houses anticipated by the Local Plan feeding into it from the south and west side of the town will be colossal.

Leaving aside the issue of building on the Green Belt, whilst the proposals may well be ‘filling in’ current space right up to the edge of the A41 there is no provision for how the excess traffic arising from these developments (plus the second phase of construction at Durrants Lane) will be handled. At a time when pre Covid-19 the morning peak periods causes traffic to back up on Shootersway beyond Barncroft Road on occasion (as people try to go about their daily business and access other areas of the town or get onto the A41) there is no justification within the documentation as to why it is deemed acceptable that more traffic congestion will be created from the proposed housing on the various sites listed within the consultation document or as to what will be done to alleviate it.

As just one of many further examples of the impact of such proposed development on current Berkhamsted residents, Greenway Primary School is situated at the end of Crossways off Shootersway on the same site as St Thomas More RC Primary School and close to many of the proposed development sites. Currently children aged 9 and above in the town are encouraged to walk to school without parents. This had been appropriate given the current traffic levels and the training available to children on pedestrian safety.

Contrary to the assurances given at the time that there would be little impact on traffic along Shootersway, since the first phase of development at Durrants Lane, traffic has already increased enormously along Shootersway particularly in the morning peak periods which causes families/pupils accessing these school sites (and also those walking on to Ashlyns) real concern in using the narrow pavements. These traffic concerns will only escalate with the build of a further 750 plus homes off Shootersway as the homeowners will all need to access Shootersway to enable movement either on to the A41 (via the only available junction) or into the town – there is no other direct route for car users to take.

Shootersway is acknowledged as being a ‘minor route’ within the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 (para 3.13) and is in fact a residential road which has little if no capacity for widening to allow for an increase in traffic caused by development at the sites highlighted within the consultation documentation. Significantly the Berkhamsted

and Tring Sustainable Transport Study 2020 fails to show any photographs of Shootersway even though this is the road that will be used by the homeowners within the proposed developments to the south and west of the town.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8611

**Person ID** 1148382

**Full Name** Anna Penning-Rowsell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposals for Berkhamsted in the Local Plan. My particular concerns include:

- Lack of specific and measurable commitment to sustainability of the development. There are no specific details of how the measures proposed will support the council's 2030 net zero carbon target.
- Biodiversity impact. The plan must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones.
- Transport links. New development at this scale needs a rethink of public transport and green modes of transport in Berkhamsted. We cannot rely on building more car parking given the climate emergency we face, and which is enshrined in council policy.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8619

**Person ID** 1266595

**Full Name** SHARON MACARTHUR-POWELL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	4/ Do you have any specific comments about any of the delivery strategies? —The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8629
<b>Person ID</b>	1266604
<b>Full Name</b>	SEB BELOE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	4/ Do you have any specific comments about any of the delivery strategies? —The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8641
<b>Person ID</b>	1266607

<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL POWELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8653
<b>Person ID</b>	1266622

<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Fisher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><u>Use of green belt space vs brownfield.</u></b></p> <p>All of the proposed development in Berkhamsted appears to be on green field sites; we have limited green space within the time due to the geographical restrictions of the site within a valley, as well as development over the years and the proposed development will only exacerbate this issue. Furthermore, it may be completely unnecessary to develop to the extent proposed if the consultation were to be based on 2021 census data and post Covid forecasts. This may also mean that existing brownfield sites become available in future years and could be redeployed to use for social housing.</p> <p>Loss of the playing fields at Haslam is a significant issue as these are supposed to be used by local community groups as part of the Berkhamsted school charitable status. Providing new space at Haresfoot is not a suitable alternative as Haslam is walkable for many people, whereas Haresfoot, due to its location near busy roads and on the other side of the roundabout is not walkable so this will also result in increased traffic.</p> <p><b><u>Traffic congestion and pollution</u></b></p> <p>Due to the geographical location of the town, all inbound and outbound traffic is forced to enter and leave via the A4251 or Kings's road from the A41. The level of traffic using the high street and it's access roads has increased significantly over recent years and further development on the edge of the town will only increase this further. Out of town developments will result in more traffic driving into the town.</p> <p>It is proven that there is a correlation between traffic, pollution and health and therefore this development will result in increased levels of pollution and poor health for existing residents.</p> <p><b><u>Infrastructure, including schools, GPs, dentists.</u></b></p> <p>The increased development will require addition capacity for schools, GPs and other services such as dentists and other health practitioners. The proposal has identified the need for an additional secondary school and two new primary schools but the location of these has not yet been identified and the land for these will come from a future allocation. This needs to be considered, including transport links as part of the proposal, not as a subsequent plan.</p> <p>The provision of additional GP, dentist and other healthcare capacity should also be a key consideration.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8687
<b>Person ID</b>	1266697
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Clive Michel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to raise my objection as a Berkhamsted resident to the planned housing developments planned for the area on the basis of inappropriate use of green belt and the fact that the Berkhamsted infrastructure is already way over subscribed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8705
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<u>Children's Services</u> . Development proposed within Berkhamsted during the plan period amounts to an increase of 1,876 dwellings on 13 separate allocations, plus further developments arising from windfall and existing developments, which

are, at this time, expected to be approximately 390 This amounts to an additional child yield of 5.3fe when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield.

In order to accommodate the additional child yield from these sites, along with the developments arising from windfall and existing commitments, sites for two new primary schools are sought (ideally, one 2fe in west of the town and one 3fe in the east of the town). In addition to this, a site of 10.78ha for a secondary school is also required in order to meet the pupil yield arising from developments within the town and further afield.

Transport. The county council welcomes the technical work presented within the evidence base for the plan and considers that many aspects are on the right track to deliver a real sustainable transport uptake in the HCC would expect these measures to be further developed and included within delivery mechanisms. Where required, these should also be included within site specific policy for either funding or integration design wise. For suitable access to public transport, a settlement wide plan for public transport routes will also be needed.

The county council has significant concerns regarding the proposed sites in south Berkhamsted. These sites are remote from existing bus services and individually none are of a size able to fund adequate service improvements. In combination however, the sites represent a significant amount of development and need to be served by buses in order to encourage use of sustainable modes from these This being particularly relevant given the local topography which may discourage walking and cycling and the distance to the town centre. Bus service improvements require significant levels of funding to come forward in regular amounts and it is difficult to see how this can be achieved given the level of development envisaged for each site, them coming forward individually and when there may be delays to developments being built out.

HCC would welcome a settlement policy to enable a growth area bus route to be a feature of all the sites masterplans as a significant way to address the cumulative impact of growth by enabling high quality access to public transport

Where existing routes in the area of development support walking and cycling, these will need to be protected fully from potential impacts and maximised/ HCC would also welcome a mechanism for funding bus services so they can be delivered in a timescale that supports modal shift, including early provision and extended services.

Transport. It is considered that this section lacks a clear decisive explanation that growth will be mitigated by enabling and unlocking sustainable transport as a real way to travel within the town and to surrounding destinations. This approach, however, is clearly being taken and HCC will welcome the production and inclusion of Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy, with the understanding that more work is needed.

The main growth area is highlighted as requiring comprehensive design, we would recommend clarity that this includes sustainable transport provision, notably to enable bus access to the sites. Significant infrastructure will be needed for real sustainable travel options to be enabled, as supported by the transport evidence. All sites, whatever the scale should be required to produce a transport Assessment (or equivalent).

Some of the sites are small and fall outside traditional limits for this work. With the level and density of growth, the county council considers all sites will generate significant amounts of movement in the context of the cumulative impact of As such, each site, including windfall, should be required to provide a travel plan, and applications should be supported by

a transport assessment. This could be either a delivery strategy policy to also capture windfall sites and included in each site's specific policy.

The vision for retail and employment should also have details on maximising opportunity for high quality spaces accessible by sustainable means, this is needed. The county council would welcome the inclusion here of a town wide travel data system to be included and key to unlocking development without severe impacts to transport networks.

#### **Paragraph 23.110**

Children's Services. The text within this paragraph that states: "...especially the need for two 2FE primary schools, a 6FE secondary school..." is incorrect (it should be one 2fe and one 3fe primary school and an 8fe secondary school). The need is for a 6fe secondary school and HCC would seek an 8fe secondary school site to allow flexibility for future

Transport. There are concerns regarding the delivery of bus service improvements to developments in south-west Berkhamsted, the number of different sites and their size is unlikely to be able to facilitate service improvements through the usual mechanisms. Each site will not generate enough demand or in a timely manner and there may be delays to sites coming forward which will make provision of bus services necessary to makes these sites sustainable highly problematic.

#### **Paragraph 23.112**

Transport. The text that states: "*the Growth Areas will secure the delivery of transportation schemes identified in the Berkhamsted Sustainable Transport Strategy, including improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre/railway station*" in order to be sustainable, these sites will also need improvements to bus However as stated above this could be significantly challenging and a settlement wide approach is needed.

#### **Paragraph 23.116**

Transport. Wording surrounding the completion of a multi-storey car park on Lower Kings Road, could be better aligned to the transport The emphasis should be on encouraging use of sustainable modes to access the town in line with LTP4. Improved car parking can simply encourage more car trips.

#### **Berkhamsted Movement**

Transport. The sustainable transport connections do not simply need to be enhanced, as this is significantly underplaying what is needed for modal shift to enable growth. It is vital for the town that a game changing shift away from internal car trips occurs, and movement within the settlement is completed by sustainable modes for most journeys. This is the only deliverable way to maintain the level of connectivity and mobility the settlement

Wording in paragraph 23.120 should be amended, as increasing road capacity is not the answer, as it just encourages more car-based trips. As stated previously, there is concern around the ability to make some of the new development sustainable. Emphasis should be on encouraging sustainable travel rather than appearing to support a strategy that has led to increasing levels of car Cycle links to the town centre and provision of high-quality cycle parking twill enable more people to cycle to reduce private car trips.

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8710
<b>Person ID</b>	334834
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Boyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wish to put on record my serious concern at the numbers of new homes being proposed for Berkhamsted. To build over 2200 new homes in the town, swelling the population of 17,000 by some 5,000 is foolhardy when the infrastructure here is already creaking. You state that you play an enabling role in the provision of infrastructure, but what happens in the real world is that expansion of homes comes first and then any thought of improving infrastructure may (and may not) come later. This is outrageous and will destroy the fabric of the town. How will the town centre accommodate such numbers? How will people park and shop on Saturdays? I am not opposed to 50 here, 50 there, in other words a measured approach in which expansion of facilities can keep in step, but the numbers mooted are unacceptable.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8715
<b>Person ID</b>	1266739
<b>Full Name</b>	REBECCA LACEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have attempted to complete your online application but have been unsuccessful. I would like to add my comments and name against your current plan for Growth in our local area. I write this having just spent the afternoon walking through our countryside and enjoying the sunshine and fresh air! I have been fortunate enough to live here for all of my 31 years and have seen how the developments in and around my local area have already had a negative impact on my beloved town before you put your plan into place. Having read your plan for our local areas I am strongly against it. You have mentioned creating open spaces in our towns but are going to develop the greenbelt land, already open space..., and used by us locals for not only our physical health but mental health. I have noticed a significant increase in the number of vehicles accessing Berkhamsted centre over the last 7 years, creating more pollution as they sit idling because the extra traffic is causing jams through our narrow high street. You are going to use our market towns to 'act as service centres for the surrounding villages' but keep the 'growth in the large villages at a scale in keeping with their local character and setting' maintaining what makes them appealing but spoiling the landscape of ours. Several of the proposed sites are going to cause Berkhamsted to merge into Northchurch causing us to lose our unique, small community to urban sprall becoming part of a much bigger town. There is no mention of developing brown belt land where businesses are not returning to their office spaces or are unable to reopen after the pandemic.</p> <p>I feel the data used to create your plan is outdated. It does not reflect the true number of residents currently in the area, the demand already placed upon the towns and villages and will not provide the housing, jobs and services actually required.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8723
<b>Person ID</b>	1266743
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRIS REID
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This is a response to the proposal above from Chris Reid (Berkhamsted resident since 2000) and Claire Reid (Berkhamsted resident since 1970) from (address removed).



Overall, we agree that there is need for additional homes, suitably placed, with good transport links and associated infrastructure. We believe however that the Council's plans are flawed on a number fronts. The key ones being:

- The number of homes (c6000) being built on existing Greenbelt is absurd and not in line with current standards stating this should only be in Exceptional cases. Building over Greenbelt should be the last resort. We are quite rightly looking to create housing for the next generation but this plan risks destroying the country-side for their future.
- We don't believe that all the opportunities across Dacorum to avoid building on Greenbelt have been maximised in what amounts to "lazy" planning trying to get to the required answer in terms of numbers as easily as possible.
- Building over Greenbelt will negatively impact climate change and the health of residents. Surely you should be working harder and maximising brown field sites opportunities.
- Lack of infrastructure to support the development in Berkhamsted in this proposal is clear. The obvious deficiencies are in the provision for traffic. Berkhamsted already suffers with bad congestion problems as it has a limited number of cross-town routes that aren't obviously expandable. This will grind the town to a standstill.
- Berkhamsted has a long history and this enormous development will significantly erode the towns character.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8726

**Person ID** 1266746

**Full Name** CLAIRE REID

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

This is a response to the proposal above from Chris Reid (Berkhamsted resident since 2000) and Claire Reid (Berkhamsted resident since 1970) from (address removed).

Overall, we agree that there is need for additional homes, suitably placed, with good transport links and associated infrastructure. We believe however that the Council's plans are flawed on a number fronts. The key ones being:

- The number of homes (c6000) being built on existing Greenbelt is absurd and not in line with current standards stating this should only be in Exceptional cases. Building over Greenbelt should be the last resort. We are quite rightly looking to create housing for the next generation but this plan risks destroying the country-side for their future.
- We don't believe that all the opportunities across Dacorum to avoid building on Greenbelt have been maximised in what amounts to "lazy" planning trying to get to the required answer in terms of numbers as easily as possible.
- Building over Greenbelt will negatively impact climate change and the health of residents. Surely you should be working harder and maximising brown field sites opportunities.
- Lack of infrastructure to support the development in Berkhamsted in this proposal is clear. The obvious deficiencies are in the provision for traffic. Berkhamsted already suffers with bad congestion problems as it has a limited number of cross-town routes that aren't obviously expandable. This will grind the town to a standstill.
- Berkhamsted has a long history and this enormous development will significantly erode the towns character.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8727

**Person ID** 1266747

**Full Name** CARLOINE BARTL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I am against the massive new housing plan for Berkhamsted. It will ruin our countryside and fill and choke the few roads.  
  
I disagree with the planned housing estates in Berkhamsted. To ruin the countryside and put more traffic on roads is absolutely NOT right.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8729
<b>Person ID</b>	1266748
<b>Full Name</b>	NICK FIELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8734
<b>Person ID</b>	1266750
<b>Full Name</b>	HELEN SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing in response to the New Dacorum Local Plan. I live in Berkhamsted, with my husband and two children (who currently attend Bridgwater Primary and Ashlyns Secondary school).

Firstly, I would like to state that carrying out a public consultation at the current time is extremely unhelpful. The complexity of the plan, combined with the additional pressures from Lockdown/Covid-19, means that many of us would have appreciated more time, and a chance to review documents in person (which is not possible at the moment).

My overall view is that the Local Plan has not properly considered the specific considerations of Berkhamsted. The size, structure and location of the town mean that any additional housing has to be carefully considered, so as to avoid undue stress on the transport, infrastructure and amenities. My key concerns are:

- Loss of green belt land
- Town centre congestion (the high street, main junction and approaching streets are already very busy)
- Capacity for extra residents - 1,000 new houses means several thousand new people in the town
- Water availability
- Provision of schools - current schools are already full, and the plan currently does not indicate how an additional secondary school would be funded or built. Ashlyns is already over subscribed.
- Provision of GP's - GP services are already very busy, and the recent merger of Berkhamsted Group practice with the Rothschild is in its infancy.... where will all these extra people be treated?

The Plan does not show a range of housing that will meet local needs.

The Plan will add over 1,000 new houses to Berkhamsted, a large number of which are accessed via Shootersway. I cannot see how the current road structure can support all these extra homes. Commuters travelling to/from the station will put extra stress on the transport system. Commuter trains will be even more overcrowded, especially with extra houses proposed in Tring, which is the stop before Berkhamsted on the train line.

**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS8737**Person ID** 1266752**Full Name** Jayne Spademan**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** Yes  
**\* Yes**

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>In addition, we wish to reinforce the points raised in regard to Sustainability and Development of green belt - which is against Government policy.</p> <p>A high proportion of development is proposed on Greenbelt - which should not be developed except in 'exceptional circumstances'.</p> <p>There is no explanation as to what the exceptional circumstances are in the Borough.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8740
<b>Person ID</b>	1266754
<b>Full Name</b>	HYWEL LLEWELLYN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I firstly thank you for the opportunity to voice my views on the development plan. I am a resident of Berkhamsted. I am writing to confirm my objection to the plans as they stand.</p>

The volume of new housing being considered eg, the proposed development at Bulboure Cross would place significant strain on Berkhamsted. Berkhamsted is already a busy and buzzy place. Unlike many towns in England, it is not struggling for life and is certainly not in need of a regeneration exercise with which, the level of proposed new housing is consistent. Traffic on the high street is consistently busy even during lockdown. There is not the parking available to accommodate potentially thousands of additional cars coming into the town for shopping etc. If not properly accommodated (or plans scaled back), my fear is that this would lead to people parking up the side streets off the high street, potentially depriving residents of parking spaces and increasing the dangers for our school children and other pedestrians.

As I understand it, there is no provision for an additional secondary school - only a primary school. I fail to see how thousands more school children can be accommodated at the secondary stage.

Finally, such a high number of new residents would put significant strain on the local healthcare services. Could local GPs and dentists really take on that many more patients?

In summary, i am registering an objection to the plans as they stand. That is not to say that a scaled back version of the plans could not be feasible (but the scale back would in my view need to be significant).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8742

**Person ID** 1266755

**Full Name** Philip Spademan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

In addition, we wish to reinforce the points raised in regard to Sustainability and Development of green belt - which is against Government policy.

A high proportion of development is proposed on Greenbelt - which should not be developed except in 'exceptional circumstances'.

There is no explanation as to what the exceptional circumstances are in the Borough.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8745

**Person ID** 1264807

**Full Name** Jonathan Gordon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am contacting you regarding the proposed development of housing by Northchurch. I do recognise that people need somewhere to live and there is a shortage of affordable housing at the present time. As we come out of Covid and the uncertain economic future after such a tough year the availability of housing and also communities that can flourish are of fundamental importance. I went to a community meeting (online) recently and listened to some very eloquent speakers that were able to state the case against in terms of impact on the environment. My fundamental concern as a resident of Northchurch is linked with the local school. A few years ago I took the funeral service of a little girl who had been struck by a minibus on the road by the George and Dragon public house. In the aftermath there was a focus on setting up Northchurch 20 mph, but as time has passed this campaign has become

quieter. I remember the night of the accident very well. It was a wet dark evening and the little girl was crossing the road after a Guides meeting and the driver was distracted. There is a pedestrian crossing close by, but it was just one of those times that a split decision was taken that was to have tragic results. Thankfully this has been the only fatal accident in recent times, but I have witnessed a child lose their balance on the pavement while cycling and fallen into the road. The pavements are narrow and with the school on New Road the amount of foot traffic is very high. As you head towards Ashridge the road crosses the canal and traffic going up the hill has priority. On a good few occasions I have witnessed the aftermath of crashes due to speeding. I think my fundamental concern is that the pavement is narrow, the road is not suited to heavy volumes of traffic and children safety is at risk. In recent years the school has launched slow down initiatives and raised awareness of the issue. The increase of housing in the locality is only going to increase pressure on an area of congestion that is struggling to cope at the present time.

Thank you for your time and commitment to finding the best way forward for the Dacorum region.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8747

**Person ID** 1266757

**Full Name** Lyndsey Williams

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8751
<b>Person ID</b>	1266760
<b>Full Name</b>	LIS TROLLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Whilst I understand the local council is under pressure to build more houses in berkhamsted I strongly oppose. I think before more housing is approved a clear plan of how to improve infrastructure here in town is much more important. We need more schools, more GP's ( at the moment I have waited 30+ min to get through on the phone just to get an appointment).</p> <p>We need bike paths so kids in secondary school can bike safely to school.</p> <p>What about the roads going in and through berkhamsted is already congested. So if council can get things like that in place then you will have my full support.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8757
<b>Person ID</b>	1266764
<b>Full Name</b>	LAURA GOSLING
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request that you accept my email as confirmation that I wish Dacorum Borough Council to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8758
<b>Person ID</b>	1266765
<b>Full Name</b>	ANNE AMLOT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to object to the Dacorum Borough Council Emerging Strategy for growth plan. The proposal will have a significant impact on the infrastructure of the town and quality of life for the residents, with increased pollution; loss of Green Belt land in an Area of Natural Beauty; and huge pressure on local services. There is also the very real prospect that the properties will remain unsold with fewer people requiring housing in commuter belts.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8762
<b>Person ID</b>	1266768
<b>Full Name</b>	LARA GRAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.  Please save the green belt.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8763
<b>Person ID</b>	1266770
<b>Full Name</b>	CHARLIE GRAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i>  <i>Please save the green belt.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8764
<b>Person ID</b>	1266772
<b>Full Name</b>	SAM GRAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>Please save the green belt.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8769
<b>Person ID</b>	491181
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Marianne Shell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation using research, knowledge and time for consideration which it is unrealistic for most individual respondents to have available. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name, and to note my opposition to the proposals.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8775

**Person ID** 1261740

**Full Name** Zoe Greenall

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

My house overlooks a large part of the proposed development areas within the Dacorum growth strategy. The fields on the far side of the valley including the 'stick man tree' as it is called in our house (some refer to this as the wishing tree) are the only green spaces visible across the valley from this side and I am so sad and worried that this green space is at risk.

I have only recently heard about the plans to develop housing on these fields and was shocked to not have received information directly from the council given that it is such a huge proposed plan. I understand there is a deadline today and felt I must contact you to please extend this and seriously consider the impact of these plans on the local area.

The number of houses totalled in the plans is ridiculous when you actually live here and know the infrastructure of the Northchurch and Berkhamsted area. Doctors surgeries, schools and roads will be hugely impacted by the proposed numbers. Parking is already an issue in Berkhamsted hence the new car park which only opened recently and it would be unbearable for accessing the chemist, supermarkets, library, opticians and other essential shops with the level of traffic these developments would add to the town.

I've got two school aged children and really worry that the one secondary school within walking distance for most families would be overwhelmed by the sheer numbers proposed. I heard that a new secondary school is proposed within the plans but haven't had time to read more about this.

The aesthetics of the area would certainly be impacted greatly by the addition of more houses but my main concern is that Berkhamsted and Northchurch do not have the infrastructure to support the level of increases proposed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8776

**Person ID** 1266778

**Full Name** AMY MITCHELL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am devastated about the prospect of this beautiful patch of green will be built on. This green supports such a huge estate of families that need space to explore and exercise.

Not to mention how disruptive and dangerous this will be to the children and staff at bridgewater school every single day . Plus the pollution for the families and school children, and noise pollution. The road access up to bridgewater is congested and dangerous as it is for families that need to drive to drop their children off, the added pressure of heavy building traffic will be very dangerous and disruptive.

The reason we moved to where we are is the quick access into the beautiful countryside and greenery, and the wonderful position of bridgewater school, close to the countryside and surrounded by green. Berkhamsted has a truly unique balance of small town and access to greenery from where we live. We would definitely re consider where we are raising our family and possibly moving should this development happen. It would be so sad for future generations to come.

I also feel disappointed as I don't feel like I have had any communication from the council about the proposed plans. Particularly in a pandemic when everyone is distracted and unable to meet to discuss plans.

So sad, please don't build on this beautiful green belt.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8777
<b>Person ID</b>	1266780
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Sommerfeld & Mark Wallington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are writing to oppose the proposed over development of Berkhamsted and Tring. Berkhamsted's infrastructure is already over stretched and we feel the destruction of more green belt is ruining the beauty of the area. As residents and keen walkers in the area we are acutely aware of the over development in this town already!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8780
<b>Person ID</b>	1266781
<b>Full Name</b>	VICTORIA SINDERMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to object to the proposals for all the additional expansion of new houses in Berkhamsted. I do not believe the ecological impact has been considered with regard to the air in the town and also the actual buildings - their green credentials of materials and the loss of the green space. The roads around town are already extremely busy in normal times and the amenities could not cope with huge additional numbers. There are other brown belt sites which have not been explored and so I object to any green belt land being used. It changes the whole dynamic of the town and the surroundings and the impact of this would be irreversible.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8820
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Here are our initial thoughts on the Delivery Strategy -

- Loss of a significant area of open countryside – can this be justified?
- Takes up almost every field to the south and west of Berkhamsted - will have a significant impact on the character of the settlement. No longer a patchwork of open fields and developed areas.
- Are there exceptional circumstances to remove the sites from the Green Belt?
- The openness of the Green Belt is a critical feature of all the sites.
- Contrary to purposes of the Green Belt – encroachment into open countryside.
- Loss of open space for recreation
- A Masterplan will be critical.
- Views to and from the AONB would be impacted to the south onto Darrs Lane and the south/west side of the valley from Berkhamsted and Northchurch Commons, and Shootersway to the AONB south of town.
- Will increase the housing numbers in Berkhamsted by 31% - this is too much.
- Some development close to town edge might be possible although some distance from town centre and facilities and could be deemed unsustainable given the steep valley sides.
- What justification is there for such a large increase in this historic town?
- Has development in the town centre / existing urban area been maximised?
- The additional water usage would be likely to have a detrimental impact on flows in the River Bulbourne, which is one of the Chilterns' internationally important chalk streams.
- Public transport is very limited, buses do not serve Shootersway or the other areas of development along Darrs Lane and it is confined to the High Street, and the station is nearly 2 miles up/down hill from most of the build. Hence there will be a huge increase in private vehicular movements.

**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS8830**Person ID** 1158356**Full Name** Colin Blundel**Organisation Details** Planning Officer  
Chiltern Society**Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** Yes**\* Yes****\* No**

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted is almost entirely surrounded by Green Belt and, to the south and west of the town, this creates an open gap to the A41 which bypasses the town. At present, this area consists of a mosaic of built- up areas and open fields, including agricultural fields and playing fields. The whole of this area is within the setting of the Chilterns AONB to the south, interrupting views from the town and Shootersway in particular.</p> <p>The scale of development proposed is excessive and would fill up most of the open fields in the area, greatly harming the local environment. We would wish to see development concentrated in the existing urban area of the town and concentrating on the reuse of shops and offices and other conversions. If some development is to be allowed on green fields it should be greatly scaled down.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8846
<b>Person ID</b>	1266793
<b>Full Name</b>	Tony Ayles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that the current and future infrastructure will put a strain on the community.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8849
<b>Person ID</b>	1148361

<b>Full Name</b>	Joy Kingsbury
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that the current and future infrastructure will put a strain on the community.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8851
<b>Person ID</b>	1266797
<b>Full Name</b>	Lesley Wood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. I entirely agree with them on all points. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8856

**Person ID** 1266800

**Full Name** Jennifer Main

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to lodge my objection to the building on this green belt site.

Berkhamsted's infrastructure is all ready struggling with the current level development, we do not need to build on green belt and farmland. We need to consider infill and repurposing of existing building rather than the destruction of the countryside.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8860

**Person ID** 1266802

**Full Name** Penelope Webster

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please see below my objections to the plan to build so many new houses on the outskirts of Berkhamsted, resulting in a huge increase of the local population:</p> <p>Doctors: more GP surgeries would be required, with more GPs recruited. Young doctors find it hard to buy a house in this area due to high house prices.</p> <p>Schools: local parents are failing to get places for their children at Ashlyns. With hundreds more children in the area, another secondary school would have to be built.</p> <p>This would take years to come about and at an enormous financial cost.</p> <p>Local primary schools are full.</p> <p>Traffic: in normal times, Berkhamsted is heavy with traffic, despite the bypass.</p> <p>Thousands more cars would exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>Parking: it is almost impossible to find a parking place on any of Berkhamsted's side streets.</p> <p>In normal times, the station car park is full. Many times I have been unable to park there in the morning. Many of the owners of the planned new houses will undoubtedly be commuters.</p> <p>Where will they park? A multi storey car park will have to be built at the station to accommodate the demand.</p> <p>At peak commuting times the trains are already overcrowded.</p> <p>The Green Belt:</p> <p>This should not be violated.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8862
<b>Person ID</b>	1145090
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Gary Mahoney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8863
<b>Person ID</b>	1266806
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Mahoney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8875
<b>Person ID</b>	1266816
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs J Mallory

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to add my voice to those who have already said that the new developments that are proposed around Berkhamsted. Please do not go ahead with these proposed developments. We are a small town that is groaning under the weight of the new developments that have already been built in Berkhamsted over the last ten years. The town does not have enough school places, there are not enough parking spaces in town, traffic is becoming heavier and there certainly are not enough doctors and dentists to take care of the population that we already have in the town! It is extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment and there are no more NHS dentist spaces available forcing residents to go further afield for dental care. Your new housing proposals do not take the need for medical care into consideration.</p> <p>We live in an area of outstanding natural beauty and are surrounded by green belt and farmland. Your proposal of house building will take away the beautiful countryside that we love and use for walking in being able to get closer to nature – something that has become a life line during this pandemic.</p> <p>We already have sports facilities in Berkhamsted. Instead of building new ones, use the money to rejuvenate or extend the ones we already have. Our swimming pool could really do with an upgrade!</p> <p>By building on the proposed sites the traffic and air pollution will be worse, what will the impact on nature be? We have a chalk stream, a globally rare habitat, that needs conserving. I'm concerned that the increase in run off and building works will pollute this special and unique ecosystem.</p> <p>I moved to Berkhamsted as it is a beautiful town surrounded by greenery and countryside. We have wonderful views over forests and fields. Please don't destroy what we hold dear by building on these beautiful green belts. We need them, now more than ever. I understand that people need houses, but surely we can build those houses on brownfield sites and where land has already been developed?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8876
<b>Person ID</b>	1145563
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8877
<b>Person ID</b>	1145563
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The plan rightly observes that the town is linear and nestles in a steep sided valley which severely limits its potential for expansion.</p> <p>The plan also rightly proposes that future development should be masterplan led to ensure that all necessary supporting infrastructure should be in place to enable future housing provision.</p> <p>The plan also, rightly, points out that there is limited spare capacity in the local road network and that future transport provision should be “sustainable” (in fact the plan makes many references to proposals being “sustainable” - repetition does not however make this true).</p>



Despite the above observations the plan predominantly develops the land between the southern edge of the town and the bypass. This land is too far from the town centre to expect people to walk. It is on high ground where it will be unreasonable to expect people to cycle. In reality car usage and associated congestion will increase - especially in peak hours as the new residents drive to the station to commute to Euston. This much is obvious and is in no way "sustainable."

In short the town has very limited capacity for expansion, having grown significantly in recent decades. Future development needs should be met by determining the sensible limits of expansion for each town and village, and unmet demand should be met by new town provision. This approach would indeed be masterplan led and would be far far preferable to the status quo, whereby it is assumed that housing need can be met by simply asking developers to build more housing estates.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8883

**Person ID** 1266822

**Full Name** Tim Taylor

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I write this email as an objection to the particular planned development for Berkhamsted as detailed in the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038).

I understand the needs of the country to build new houses due to a shortage of homes. However, I feel that for a number of reasons the proposals should be reexamined: -

- 1 Timetable.

Due to COVID-19 lockdown restrictions, residents have not had chance to view the plans in a full consultative manner. Instead, this has been provided virtually with minimum engagement within the community. I only found out about this plan through word of mouth, I would have expected a brochure to have been posted to my home. Therefore, I am suspicious that this development plan is being rushed through for the benefit of the developer and not the residents Dacorum. I am concern that this could be interpreted as corruption of the council.

- 1 Traffic

Shooterway is a bottleneck road during peak times as drivers approach the A41 and A416 to Chesham. Without increased infrastructure spending on this road or an alternative route onto the A41 the current road will not be able to take the extra capacity.

1 Environmental standard.

The building industry is very conservative with its designs. The UK needs to have housing developments with a zero-carbon philosophy. This needs to eliminate any fossil fuel burning plant within the homes. Have these homes been fitted with biomass boilers or heat pumps with the correct heat emitters build into the property? (e.g., underfloor heating, area for boreholes, etc.)? Are the buildings going to be fitted with Solar PV panels or wind turbines to allow them to generate zero carbon electricity, which can fed back into the energy grid to offset the carbon footprint incurred during the build.

1 Community

What links to public transport has been proposed, the bus service around Berkhamsted is very poor with access to many villages not served, especially at off peak times in the evening and at weekends?

1 Air Emission – Electric Vehicles

I am concern that the charging infrastructure will not be in place at the houses. Will a suitable garage or driveway be constructed allow for two cars to charge overnight? Has three phase electric charging infrastructure been considered?

1 Internet

Internet speed is very slow within my property, which is a major concern given that I am having to work from home due to the COVID-19 restrictions. With additional properties in Northchurch, I am concerned that the already poor performing broadband facilities will get worst, and not be suitable for any new houses whilst affected houses like mine with even slower processing speeds.

1 Waste Recycling Centre

The Waste Recycling Centre is already too full with long waits, this is compounded by the council closing the facility on Thursday and Friday alongside no collection of garden waste for many weeks of the years. Having more properties in Berkhamsted is only going to make this problem worst given the lack of desire from DBC to address this problem in their party manifestos.

If all these points are addressed and significantly mitigation can be put in place with appropriate documentation clearly stating the aims of the developer which benefits the existing and new residents of Berkhamsted then I would be happy to support any development. However, I feel this is not the case with this proposal put forward.

I welcomed your reply to understand how both DBC and the housing developer intend to address the concerns laid out in this email.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8892

<b>Person ID</b>	1265047
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Wright
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have serious concerns about the lack of sustainable infrastructure to meet the needs of future generations and the environment. In particular there is minimal information and plans relating to supporting electric vehicles and public transport.</p> <p>I also have concerns about the limited community facilities presented required to support a significant increase in population, including healthcare, childrens play areas, and community spaces.</p> <p>The data and information underpinning the proposals do not adequately take into account the unique circumstances of Berkhamsted, its environment and geography. The numbers of house proposed build on green belt with an unjustified housing target and projections, and without considering alternatives to maximise housing on brown field sites.</p> <p>The strategy also fails to consider how working patterns and lifestyles may change as a result of the pandemic, and what this might mean for future housing requirements.</p> <p>I therefore disagree with the proposals and believe a huge amount of more work is required to identify the most effective solution to providing housing in the local areas.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8896
<b>Person ID</b>	1266826
<b>Full Name</b>	Nigel Squire
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In line with the request for comment about local development. Please note that the current infrastructure is not adequate for additional housing. For example, the water pressure on the hills to south side of Berkhamsted is already low, and in during the summer when there is high demand the water from taps attached to the mains is little more than a trickle. Additional demand from additional housing would exacerbate the problem. Should there be a fire on the south hills, there may well be inadequate water pressure to control the blaze. I oppose the further development of Berkhamsted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8898
<b>Person ID</b>	1266835
<b>Full Name</b>	Stef Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Northchurch Common . An area of outstanding natural beauty , nestled in the Chiltern Hills , in the Greenbelt .</p> <p>I am writing to log my objection to the proposals contained in the DBC emerging strategy for growth plan .</p> <p>The sheer size of the housing proposal(16.8k houses) is very worrying .</p> <p>400 new homes in Northchurch itself . This will destroy the village entirely . It will become a suburb of Berkhamsted . It is not West Berkhamsted. It is a village that dates from Roman times. It is flanked by 15th and 16th century almshouses . But now under the DBC plans it will become a huge traffic jam ! The main road A4251 is already heavily congested at key times of day creating unacceptable levels of air pollution . Northchurch children are already subjected to the poor air quality on their way to and from school . The increased traffic also raises the safety concerns , more parents will drive their children - compounding the traffic issues .</p>

I believe that the Greenbelt was conceived and made law to protect rural England from urban sprawl .I cannot see that DBC have proved it necessary to build on it. Have they exhausted all brown field options ? I don't think so. Post pandemic offices in towns will remain empty , as people choose to work from home - and business choose to cut costs.

Our village life and Greenbelt are paramount to our mental health- our British wildlife and our planet !!

New Road ( Northchurch to Ashridge) has a small one way Victorian bridge spanning the canal. This is close St Mary's school . It suffered already with increased traffic . When the M1 is problematic drivers take a scenic route bringing them across the hills down into Northchurch over this bridge to access a41 . Anymore traffic will undoubtedly present a danger.

In summary the DBC proposals

- 1 Ignore that residents love the area - as it is , a village , surrounded by ancient countryside , with rare and unfettered views.
- 2 The DBC proposals have a cavalier attitude to the Greenbelt principle. It is in existence to protect areas like ours from urbanisation .
- 3 Not considered sufficiently the impact of air pollution .
- 4 DBC proposals seem to be ploughing on regardless despite the massive number of homes needed generated by central government has been revised , as the algorithms were proven incorrect . This explosion of new homes is based on 2014 projections . Get the numbers right !
- 5 Big question around if any of these homes will be affordable for families not already on the housing ladder.

I URGE DBC to think again on this proposal . And come up with a solution more fitting for this area. These decisions are irreversible . Our natural environment and wildlife are precious and the Greenbelt is there to ensure our children and grandchildren can enjoy it.

I don't want urban sprawl and air quality below guidelines. Build suitable homes in suitable areas with infrastructure properly considered .

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8902

**Person ID** 1266838

**Full Name** Michael and Janet Floyd

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My husband & I totally oppose the buildings that will be going on in Northchurch. Firstly we live in Southbank Road which leads out into New Road & cars are always parked up the road & on the bridge obscuring my view from any traffic either way. Recently I pulled out of my road & a truck speeding crashed into me & I had to foot the bill for both cars. The road is like a racetrack considering there is a school St Mary's & an old people's home. With lorries going over that narrow bridge would be a disaster plus builders & their transport. The road is so narrow it just wouldn't work because it is such a busy road now. As for the buildings at the back of Granville road is a shame to build on Greenbelt land making Northchurch into a concrete jungle for future generations. Also it would definitely spoil the view I now have from Southbank Road.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8903
<b>Person ID</b>	1266839
<b>Full Name</b>	Frederick Wyborn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038 and I wish you to accept this confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAGs responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8904
<b>Person ID</b>	213276
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Nigel Earle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8905
<b>Person ID</b>	1266841
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael French
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS8906
<b>Person ID</b>	224464
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Tanya Assarat
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8907
<b>Person ID</b>	1266844
<b>Full Name</b>	Ann Bradbury
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p>



The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8908

**Person ID** 1266845

**Full Name** Dean Edwards

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8921

**Person ID** 1266855

**Full Name** Judy Barnes

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamsted I find these proposals heart breaking.. A 24% increase in housing development would destroy the local, environment for human and wildlife inhabitants alike and is based on out of date (2014) projections which are now deemed to be reduced. Furthermore, the recent developments in, for example, Shootersway and Durrants Lane have already destroyed wildlife habitat and are not the required “affordable” housing which is needed. The government’s definition of affordable is way beyond the means of those most in need. Existing brownfield sites and vacant high street properties (which are likely to increase further in the current economic climate) should be used instead.</p> <p>The climate emergency and biodiversity loss has been completely ignored in these proposals and this is the greatest tragedy facing us all. Habitat loss due to housing development can never be replaced and the suggested narrow strip beside the A41 is laughably inadequate - it does not even include wildlife tunnels and already the roadkill along the A41 is horrendous.</p> <p>Air pollution due to traffic in Berkhamsted and Northchurch is already very serious and sometimes above permitted legal limits and has become worse since the introduction of the 2014-2018 Air Quality Act. As a valley town the surrounding open spaces are our lungs and every schoolchild knows that it takes many years for newly planted trees to contribute to significant carbon capture. As is well known, air pollution is now legally recognised as a cause of death - does DBC want this on its conscience?</p> <p>Potential water supply problems were identified by the outdated 2011 survey and the population has greatly increased since then and the proposed developments would obviously make that worse.</p> <p>The local infrastructure cannot support further population increase. Schools are already over-subscribed and existing healthcare provision is under extreme pressure.</p> <p>GP practices in Tring and Berkhamsted have now merged and Tring is facing even greater development and population increase. The Gossoms End practice has 6 parking spaces! Hospital provision is also inadequate and difficult to access as are all aspects of social care.</p> <p>These proposed developments are on Greenbelt land and contravene official government policy.</p> <p>These proposals would make life immeasurably worse for those of us who live here and the prospect of Berkhamsted, Tring and Aylesbury becoming a hideous suburban sprawl would not make the area attractive to prospective residents.</p> <p>If we do not deal with the climate emergency and fail to work with nature instead of destroying that of which we are a part, there is little point in anything else. DBC should abandon its short term political ambitions and pressure from developers and have the courage to take a long term view in the interests of all. The recent comprehensive report from the Council for the Protection of Rural England must be understood and acted upon. Among many others, I will personally vote for any party which commits to abandon DBC’s proposals and adopt a sustainable, environmentally friendly policy.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8924
<b>Person ID</b>	1146039
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Griffin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>I do NOT agree with ANY more building in or around Berkhamsted – unless on brownfield sites, and, even then, severely limited in scope.</p> <p>There must be NO building on ANY greenbelt land – it is there for a very good reason and NO valid justifications have be provided to do so.</p> <p><b>NONE – DO NOT DO IT.</b></p> <p>There is NO requirement for the ridiculous and downright greedy number of developments.</p> <p>Anyone that’s lived in the town for a few years will have witnessed the steady decline in the quality of life here. This is substantially due to over-building and over-population with little to no corresponding increase in services and amenities. The town itself has surprisingly little green space and the building developments over the years have provided almost none.</p> <p>The high street, which is already over-burdened and polluted, will rapidly descend to gridlock. How are you expecting all these THOUSANDS of new inhabitants to get to (say) Waitrose and back? The A41 won’t help you here. It’s not just about housing over-development and over-crowding, it’s about massive over-population also. What hope for getting a timely GP appointment or a school place? None.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>In conclusion, the strategy is very poorly thought out/through, shows no consideration for existing residents, is completely unrealistic in it’s assertions and reeks of greed. What is clear is that the quality of life for the</p>

residents will sharply decline and the town will become yet another polluted eye-sore gridlocked dump that no-one wants to live or work in.

**DO NOT PROCEED.**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8926

**Person ID** 1266858

**Full Name** Caroline Brode

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation section 23.1 - Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.

I **DO NOT** support this application which also includes the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the East of Berkhamsted for the following reasons:

1) The housing numbers in this Local Plan across Dacorum, and therefore Berkhamsted are excessive and wrong. They are well above the forecast housing need for the Borough as calculated by the ONS

2) The impact on West berkhamsted is disproportionate, does not consider existing and recent major developments in the area (Bearroc park) and severely impacts infrastructure (rads / schools / Hospitals /etc) pollution, congestion, road safety, local ecology, health and well being of local residents.

3) It wastes acres of farmland and beautiful countryside and damages the setting of the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

4) The number of houses proposed in relation to the number of local jobs available will mean commuting will be worse

I therefore call upon Dacorum Borough Council to

HALT the Local Plan Consultation

Re-draw the plan based on the recent housing densities achieved.

DEMAND that housing targets are based on up-to-date estimates

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8928

**Person ID** 1266859

**Full Name** Colin Lewis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth, 2020-38: Draft Plan for Berkhamsted

I write to express my concern and opposition for the proposed developments in Berkhamsted. My reasons for doing so are threefold: the density and inappropriateness of the scale of the proposed expansion – especially the loss of green spaces; pressure on local services and infrastructure – suggested ‘improvement’ are inadequate in the extreme; adverse impact of the development on road safety and the environment.

Looking at the scale, locations and density of proposed expansion in Berkhamsted, much of the development appears to be on greenbelt. This would markedly erode existing green spaces in and around the town and have an adverse impact on habitat and environment generally. Notwithstanding the proposed ‘news country park’ alongside the Bulboure Cross development, there will be a large net loss of ‘green lungs’. The loss of green spaces is compounded by additional health and safety hazards, discussed further below, and will lead to the degradation of the environment.

The adverse impact of the proposed developments on road safety relates to conditions on the A41 and the centre of the town - along the A4251. The A41 is already one of the most dangerous trunk roads in the county, as highlighted by the frequency of accidents and fatalities. Traffic along the town centre bypass section already exceeds planned capacity. With major development planned at both ends – locations that are some distance from the railway station, road commuter traffic along the bypass will grow exponentially. Various sections of the plan indicate that the topography of the area discourages commuting by bicycle. Although the Bulbourne Cross development is described as having its own access to the A41, this hardly contributes to ‘safety enhancement’, let alone an infrastructure upgrade. The existing access point was planned and constructed to deal with limited movement to and from a small industrial estate, not a large housing development. Taken together, the developments will result in a sequence of closely bunched A41 access/egress points,

each of which will generate high volumes of traffic at peak times, making an already dangerous section of the dual carriageway even more congested and hazardous as traffic bunches, slows and accelerates. The scale of housing developments clustered around the Tring access/egress junction points to a similar exponential and dangerous increase in traffic volumes.

Given distances from the town centre, planned large developments at each end of Berkhamsted, along with some smaller sites close to the centre, will generate a large increase in intra-town driving and commuting. The existing proposals appear to have given insubstantial thought to resolving these problems – both the mechanics of transit and related pollution. Hazards associated with the Bulboure Cross development, and nearby sites to the east and west of Swingate Lane, are especially acute, and likely to cause congestion and exceptional dangers for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers around the junction of London Road and Swingate Lane. The virtual lack of recognition of such dangers, as well as the growth in intra-urban traffic (given the location of the proposed sites) for shopping and leisure suggests a lack of awareness of existing traffic densities and travel patterns in and around the High Street. Such problems are hardly address in a meaningful manner in planning documents.

To conclude: the scale of development is out of keeping with the character of the town; no thought appears to have been given to providing an integrated intra-town transport system to cope with an exponential growth in local traffic, nor to health and safety problems that will result from an increase in traffic along the A41 around the town; the sum of the developments will result in a substantial loss of green space in and close to the town, with a resulting degradation of environment and amenities.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8932
<b>Person ID</b>	1266864
<b>Full Name</b>	Nick Ward
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8934

**Person ID** 1264607

**Full Name** Clare Price

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to voice my concerns for the above planning proposal.

I struggle to understand the need for the high number of houses - over 16,000 across the borough, and in particular the 400 for Northchurch. Northchurch is my local community in which the school, church and local people pride themselves in their community spirit and togetherness. We love being close to Berkhamsted and Tring but do not wish to lose our own identity. I do not believe that it will also address the need for affordable housing for the local community, and will simply encourage the wealthier to move to the area and drive the locals out.

I am also concerned about pressure on the local infrastructure and amenities. Local healthcare and education facilities are already stretched at times. The location of the new houses also suggest that access into the main towns located within the plans, will encourage a higher number of cars on the local roads. My daughter currently walks from Northchurch, across Berkhamsted, to her secondary school, and with an increased number of cars on the road, I fear even more for her safety. There is already a road awareness campaign in Northchurch to lower the speed limit to 20mph.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8936

**Person ID** 1266867

**Full Name** Amanda Davis

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8938
<b>Person ID</b>	1266875
<b>Full Name</b>	PERKS EMILY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to express serious concern about the proposed development plan. Most of my comments are directed towards the increase in development of Berkhamsted and Northchurch. I am very familiar with the town having lived and worked in the town for 40 years. I would firstly like to point out that Berkhamsted is an old market town with huge historic significance that should not be indiscriminately developed without thought for the heritage of the area, much of the town is a conservation area and although the development is outside of the conservation area the increase in population of the roads and services will have a significant effect.</p>



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8939
<b>Person ID</b>	1266875
<b>Full Name</b>	PERKS EMILY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The road system in Berkhamsted was first development in in the early 1900. The roads are limited due to the geographically constraint of a valley with a canal and railway running through the middle. There is very little that can be done to alter and improve the current road systems. On the south side of Berkhamsted/Northchurch there are only 5 roads that run from the top of the valley to the high street. 2 of these are a single track road with few passing places. There is a 6th which I am not counting because it is a one way. These roads are already at maximum capacity at busy times of the day. It can take 30 mins to queue along Shootersway in order to leave the town in the morning. The high street is already at capacity with several traffic lights and can be gridlocked with school traffic and commuter in the morning. Traffic getting to town centre to use the services of the high street will have to use existing small roads, that are narrow and dangerous with little provision for pedestrians.</p> <p>There are three main bridges that bring traffic over from the north side to the south. These are again at maximum capacity with severe traffic congestion.</p> <p>Building another on/off ramp to access the A41 at the south west end of Berkhamsted will help to take some of the new traffic, however the A41 is an extremely dangerous road, with a terrible record for road safety. I would want to see report from Highways as to what safety measure are being put into place to improve the safety of this road.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8940

<b>Person ID</b>	1266875
<b>Full Name</b>	PERKS EMILY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It is not an area I am an expert on but my understanding is that there is already significant stress on the sewage waste removal and that there is a potential shortage of water supply in this area. This will only get worse with global warming and increased development.</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>Proposals of further schools are only of use if the children can safely walk to school. There is has been a request and petition for a crossing outside Ashlyns which has been ignored. There is currently no street lighting along Chesham road which is very dangerous for children walking from Ashlyns and Berkhamsted school. The plans do not include any improvement for current pedestrians or cycle routes.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8943
<b>Person ID</b>	1266877
<b>Full Name</b>	JACK HARBIDGE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object to the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>It is clear that DBC have simply taken the easy way out to fit an excessive housing target into Dacorum by accommodating developer demand on easy to build land rather than producing a plan for the good of the Borough and its residents, current and future.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) have made an extensive submission to DBC and I wish to endorse every section of BRAG's response.</p> <p>The Government have made it crystal clear that their standard methodology for calculating housing need is NOT a target and that it cannot be given as the exceptional circumstances required to release Green Belt.</p> <p>The most recent evidence base and ONS figures clearly show that future housing need can be accommodated without making further Green Belt releases, most of it in the more expensive land price areas of the Borough which makes nonsense of the Boroughs stated need for starter/affordable homes.</p> <p>Furthermore, DBC's unexplained manipulation/reduction of projected windfalls indicates DBCs desire rather than reluctance to release Green belt for development. There is absolutely no evidence that urban areas have been prioritised.</p> <p>I'm a young person who want to get on the property ladder, but this plan categorically will not help me. It facilitates developers to build the wrong houses in the wrong places.</p> <p>I could go on but BRAG has provided a complete and thorough response to the consultation, so please duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8945
<b>Person ID</b>	1266881
<b>Full Name</b>	CLARE SIMPSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to log several strong objections to this plan; especially that concerning northchurch end of berkhamsted</p> <p>These objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Building on green belt especially so near AONB. We have the stunning ashridge estate on our doorstep but the fields and green spaces surrounding it are key to protecting this space and retaining it's unique character</li> <li>2 The local infrastructure couldn't cope with either the construction disruption or permanent population increase. Unlike nearby towns (e.g. chesham and hemel) the main road runs right through northchurch and berkhamsted and is regularly backed up with traffic. The road that runs past st marys school up to ashridge estate is already horribly dangerous. On several occasions now whilst walking my kids to school I have had my arm brushed by a passing lorry or van. Beyond the traffic noise and conjection I am also worried about the air pollution. We moved out of central London (Ealing) due to my youngest's asthma being triggered by horrific levels of pollution surrounding his primary school. The commuter trains into London are also already running at full capacity</li> <li>3 The plans proposed would negatively impact the historic nature of northchurch as a village in it's own right</li> <li>4 The process adopted for consultation has not taken the pandemic and recent lockdown into account enough. We have only just heard of these plans and have had to try to make time to log a complaint whilst already juggling homeschool and work</li> </ol> <p>Thanks for your consideration. We hope to see the plans adapted according to the local feedback and more time made for public consultation</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8949
<b>Person ID</b>	1266884
<b>Full Name</b>	TOM & CLAIRE DOUGHERTY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<p>Yes / No * Yes * No</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p><b>3.Greenbelt Issues and Merging of towns:</b></p> <p>If this plan were to go ahead, it will mean thousands of houses being built on greenbelt land, including over 400 houses in Northchurch.</p> <p>The CPRE states that <i>“One third of the countryside area in Dacorum Borough is within the Chilterns AONB and that this is a designated protected landscape of national importance, which the Borough Council has a legal duty to protect and enhance. As well as ensuring the protection of the AONB area itself, the Borough Council must also ensure the protection of the setting of the AONB. This is the land outside the boundaries of the AONB where inappropriate development could impact on the special qualities of the AONB, due to its visual intrusion but also due to noise, vehicle traffic and pollution.”</i></p> <p>The CPRE findings are also backed up by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in sections 13 and 15 as per the details below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Development goes against Section 13, relating to Green Belt use. By definition (point 134) <i>“The Green Belt serves five purposes:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;</i></li> <li>b) <i>to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;</i></li> <li>c) <i>to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</i></li> <li>d) <i>to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and</i></li> <li>e) <i>to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>The proposed development will mean the sprawl of large built up areas, the merging of Berkhamsted into Northchurch into Tring, it would encroach the on countryside and does not encourage the use of derelict and other urban land as part of the proposal. The proposal does not even recognise Northchurch as a separate entity and is referred to in the plans as West Berkhamsted, clearly a sign of what the future will hold if these plans go ahead.</p> <p>Section 15, point 170, which deals with Conserving and enhancing the natural environment states that: <i>“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>protecting and enhancing valued landscapes</i></li> <li>b) <i>recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside</i></li> <li>e) <i>preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans;”</i></li> </ol> <p>The development in question does not take any of these items into consideration and will destroy 850 hectares of Hertfordshire Green Belt land, countryside and urban green spaces.</p>

Due to the massive effect that the coronavirus pandemic has had on businesses, it is very likely that there will be an increased amount of commercial land available in the future years, which could be used for residential use and the plan fails to identify these properly. Therefore, some of the proposed green belt sites are unlikely to be required based on this and therefore the plans need to be amended to take this into account.

-

#### **4. Infrastructure and Road Safety**

The development will put a severe strain on a large number of services and does little to identify the improvements required to support the increase in housing. There is already a strain on healthcare services, education facilities and amenities.

Water supplies in the Dacorum area are already under stress, especially during dry summer months according to the CPRE. Present plans do not cover in enough detail new sources of water supply and how it will protect the three designated chalk stream in the borough (the Gade, Bulbourne and Ver). The proposed increase in housing will require substantial investment in infrastructure in order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage. The proposed plan makes no mention of how improvements in wastewater and sewerage infrastructure will be funded and the time period for their completion.

The proposed development sites are located in areas of Berkhamsted where, because of the steep relief lines and landscape of our valley town and, limited of public transport, residents use the car rather than walk or cycle. The sites put forward in Berkhamsted and Northchurch would only increase car usage and already existing problems of congestion and pollution associated to traffic.

Specifically on the proposed plans between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane – roadways and traffic will be majorly impacted. As a resident on Darrs Lane we already face daily congestion problems directly outside of our house where the road becomes a single lane road. Cars and lorries are frequently stacked up outside our house or forced to reverse back down the road to allow cars to come down the road. This will be majorly impacted if a further 200 homes are build on this field. There are no indications of how to fix this problem in the plans.

I have hugely worrying concerns over the safety for both my children and the routes that they walk to school. The roads are already busy and dangerous have resulted in numerous accidents over the years and there is large support for the local 'Go 20' group before this development has even begun.

The journey my children take everyday down Darrs lane – some of which has no walking path is a dangerous walk the down the hill already – with cars speeding down and up the hill and stacking up in queues with engines on when on single lane. This will only increase 10 fold with a proposed 200+ new homes to factor in.

-

#### **5. Environmental Factors:**

The density of these homes will also have a huge impact on the wildlife and rare species are likely to totally disappear along with the disappearance of our green areas. The Lockfield Site will mean the loss of a wildlife area which currently acts as a safe transition zone for animals trying to get up to the Ashridge Estate and the loss of the other greenfields put

forward for development will mean further loss of the countryside and its landscape. Developments will be built on ancient woodlands and the aesthetics of the whole area will be detrimentally changed.

In addition to these, when the A41 was initially built, a 'Green Lung' was created around it so that people weren't living on top of it, but this plan goes totally against that concept.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8955

**Person ID** 1262056

**Full Name** Sue & Graham Holland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We write to put forward our strong objections to the proposed Local Plan for Berkhamsted with the construction of 2236 houses in the coming future, particularly those developments planned for Shootersway and Kingshill Way.

Our reasons are listed below:-

1 Traffic

The traffic levels along Shootersway and down our road (Cross Oak) are off the scale now. With school run vehicles and delivery vehicles, people going to work etc, the traffic is nose-to-tail morning and late afternoon. There is only one speed restriction which has little effect, and in our opinion Cross Oak Road should be a limited access road because of its use as a cut through /alternative to Kings Road. With the obvious proximity of Bearroc Park, which is increasing in capacity, traffic will be at maximum levels by the end of the year anyway. The local roads are not designed for high levels of traffic, tarmac regularly breaks down, and the narrowing with no pavements puts pedestrians at risk.

1 Infrastructure

Berkhamsted's facilities are bursting at the seams NOW. Doctors surgeries are over-subscribed and not able to take more patients, schools are full. With the added injection of 2236 new households (potentially 6,500 + people) I fear the town will implode on itself.

1 Preservation of Berkhamsted as an historical town.

Berkhamsted is a market town with a lot of history. It needs to remain and retain its identity in the future.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8960

**Person ID** 222676

**Full Name** Mrs Carolyn Hill

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Whilst I have particular individual concerns I outline below, with regard to BK01 I also agree with the detailed responses provided by the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) which has responded in full (47 pages) to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I give confirmation that I wish DBC to accept my agreement with all of BRAG's submission comments for all sections of the draft plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8961

**Person ID** 495030

**Full Name** mr philip nash

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm pleased to submit my comments about the above proposed plans as follows; though I have tried, I haven't found the access point on your website to complete my response via your Portal (might be me, but I have tried)</p> <p>1 While I understand producing this plan is an obligation for you I do not feel consulted about the process. I have received no information about this plan in its current form which I thought was a mandatory part of the process.</p> <p>1 I do not believe your plan, in its current form, is not in residents of Berkhamsted (where I live) or Tring's best interests and I don't see that you have consulted sufficiently to establish otherwise.</p> <p>1 Green Belt land should not be included in this plan - The country is committed to protecting the environment and natural flora and fauna are vital to this process and we need to protect this for future generations.</p> <p>1 I understand that green field sites are an attractive and effective way of providing new housing, as planned around Tring, but I see no evidence that any thought has been given to how Tring with it's very narrow main street will be able to accommodate the extra traffic movement that will be caused by the development. The new developments are quite some distance from Tring town centre and shops - there won't be any useful bus services so people will need cars.</p> <p>Will houses be truly affordable for first time buyers?</p> <p>Will sufficient houses be available at truly affordable rents for people on minimum wages?</p> <p>Will houses be provided with proper gardens that are not always in the shade and provide space for natural rainfall drainage so that our underground water supply can be replaced?</p> <p>Is enough water available for these new houses?</p> <p>Where will people who need to drive into Tring for the shops, doctors or any other reason, park their cars?</p> <p>1 Relevant to all of the development you propose;</p> <p>Where will all of these people go to work?</p>

As it is highly likely they will need to travel beyond Dacorum it is essential that private cars should be designed into the plan and not excluded from it; hopefully cars in the future will be greener, but people are still likely to want to use them. All housing, including flats and maisonettes need to have parking facilities available and secure places to keep other forms of transport e.g bicycles.

- 1 The plan could mean an extra 60,000 people living in Dacorum. Our current resources for medical support is already stressed with an inadequate hospital provision which is difficult to travel to with worn out buildings on all sites and no plans to bring them up to date with the single rooms and good ventilation which have proved very necessary with COVID; there's also shortage of GPs and NHS dentists.
  
- 1 Berkhamsted is already congested and cannot accommodate the extra housing you propose. It is very difficult to navigate through for people going about their work (there are very few jobs in the town and very many people have no option but to drive to work) and the extra traffic will of necessity add to that. Like Tring, there is one main road going through the town and no opportunity for an alternative. The town does not lend itself to mass cycling, and just like a car they have to be left somewhere when not in use at any visited destination (few workplaces can accommodate them)
  
- 1 Where is the extra drinking water coming from?
  
- 1 All drainage systems must make their way down hill from both sides of the valley to a main drainage system; can this cope, it's not a green field site so new pipes for all utilities will have to go all over the place making them less efficient.
  
- 1 All of the developments you have proposed in Berkhamsted need to be accessed through existing urban networks which do not need the extra vehicular movements which will all peak at work travel times and many of that traffic will need to access the High Street and the central cross road junction for other routes.
  
- 1 As in Tring, where will new local jobs come?
  
- 1 Bus routes from the town are already infrequent and inadequate.

I realise this is difficult for you but Berkhamsted is already over congested and I have to object to your plan.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8975
<b>Person ID</b>	1266925
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sarah Edwards
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>As a resident of Berkhamsted, I'm specifically interested in the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 830 properties (890 residences including the flats proposed in BK10) together with a new secondary school all with Shootersway as their primary access. Despite the already busy roads there are <b>no significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow</b> included in the plan.</li> <li>• Nearly all the development will be on <b>Green Belt</b> land. The land between Shootersway and the A41 currently absorbs vehicle emissions from the A41; however this will be lost to the development of 270 houses. Air quality has been an issue in parts of our town – the development of houses plus the additional 1780 cars (2 per household) and school traffic concentrated in one area will have a significant and <b>detrimental effect</b> on the air quality of the town and the <b>health of residents</b>.</li> <li>• There are no benefits to the town that I can see from the proposal. Little land will be recreational; there is <b>little or no mention</b> of improvements to <b>walkways, public transport, cycleways, health service or sport facilities</b> for the town. It is predominately housing with the potential for new schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>These are all counter to your point 2.14:</b></p>

2.14 Our residents have told us of their concerns over the ability of the roads to accommodate high levels of housing growth and to tackle climate change we need to significantly reduce harmful emissions and particulates from transport and at the same time greatly improve local air quality. Therefore, **new development will need to be located** in places which have **excellent access to jobs, shops, services**, can quickly and **easily be reached by sustainable public transport** and benefit from **high quality walking and cycling infrastructure**. Even where journeys are made by sustainable methods it is important to minimise journey lengths, reducing demand on transport infrastructure and **delivering greater health and wellbeing**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8980

**Person ID** 333288

**Full Name** Mrs Julia Boyce

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I hereby wish to register my objection to the Dacorum Local Plan and especially to the proposals for Berkhamsted and Northchurch. The impact on the town will be disastrous: it does not have the infrastructure to support so many additional dwellings and will lead to pollution, congestion, lack of road safety and an adverse effect on local ecology and the health and well-being of local residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8981

**Person ID** 1266930

**Full Name** Ms JOANNE SAUNDERS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8986
<b>Person ID</b>	1266943
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Senem Jordan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My email is going to lay out my personal reasons for objecting the new housing plans for Dacorum. It is a very long plan and the online form is difficult to navigate so I would like to oppose the idea by email.</p> <p>We are a family of three and we have been living in Berkhamsted for over four years now. We lived in North London previously and after becoming parents we decided that London was so badly polluted it cannot be good for our health or that of our little one (Guardian,2020) and moved to Berko.</p>

Berkhamsted is a great little town with amazing people in its community and with great access to wildlife. It is a known fact that we already struggle with traffic jams in and around the High Street. According to the plans more than 900 houses will be built in Berkhamsted which I personally do not believe that this town can take such a big growth in population.

The plan has not mentioned strong improvements to the roads, public transport, cycle/walking ways or any green communal areas. If these will not be improved, the new residents have no choice but to drive. This will result in increase of air pollution, inevitable congestion and as a result decrease in health and well-being for all the residents of Berko.

It is well documented by different studies that poor air quality costs are very high - up to 19 billion pounds every year (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2021). We would rather see a plan that incorporates air quality improvements and the plan that was shared fails to do this.

Most of the proposed developments will be in Greenbelt and as far as we know it is government's policy to protect this area and we are shocked to see such a proposal using this wonderful green area we have around us. This will damage the eco system and wild life living in the Greenbelt which also works as a barrier between the town and a major road -A41.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8988

**Person ID** 1266944

**Full Name** Mr Philip Waite Jordan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

My email is going to lay out my personal reasons for objecting the new housing plans for Dacorum. It is a very long plan and the online form is difficult to navigate so I would like to oppose the idea by email.

We are a family of three and we have been living in Berkhamsted for over four years now. We lived in North London previously and after becoming parents we decided that London was so badly polluted it cannot be good for our health or that of our little one (Guardian,2020) and moved to Berko.

Berkhamsted is a great little town with amazing people in its community and with great access to wildlife. It is a known fact that we already struggle with traffic jams in and around the High Street. According to the plans more than 900 houses will be built in Berkhamsted which I personally do not believe that this town can take such a big growth in population.

The plan has not mentioned strong improvements to the roads, public transport, cycle/walking ways or any green communal areas. If these will not be improved, the new residents have no choice but to drive. This will result in increase of air pollution, inevitable congestion and as a result decrease in health and well-being for all the residents of Berko.

It is well documented by different studies that poor air quality costs are very high - up to 19 billion pounds every year (Department for Environment,Food and Rural Affairs, 2021). We would rather see a plan that incorporates air quality improvements and the plan that was shared fails to do this.

Most of the proposed developments will be in Greenbelt and as far as we know it is government's policy to protect this area and we are shocked to see such a proposal using this wonderful green area we have around us. This will damage the eco system and wild life living in the Greenbelt which also works as a barrier between the town and a major road -A41.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8990

**Person ID** 1266946

**Full Name** Mr Adam Jordan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

My email is going to lay out my personal reasons for objecting the new housing plans for Dacorum. It is a very long plan and the online form is difficult to navigate so I would like to oppose the idea by email.

We are a family of three and we have been living in Berkhamsted for over four years now. We lived in North London previously and after becoming parents we decided that London was so badly polluted it cannot be good for our health or that of our little one (Guardian,2020) and moved to Berko.

Berkhamsted is a great little town with amazing people in its community and with great access to wildlife. It is a known fact that we already struggle with traffic jams in and around the High Street. According to the plans more than 900 houses will be built in Berkhamsted which I personally do not believe that this town can take such a big growth in population.

The plan has not mentioned strong improvements to the roads, public transport, cycle/walking ways or any green communal areas. If these will not be improved, the new residents have no choice but to drive. This will result in increase of air pollution, inevitable congestion and as a result decrease in health and well-being for all the residents of Berko.

It is well documented by different studies that poor air quality costs are very high - up to 19 billion pounds every year (Department for Environment,Food and Rural Affairs, 2021). We would rather see a plan that incorporates air quality improvements and the plan that was shared fails to do this.

Most of the proposed developments will be in Greenbelt and as far as we know it is government's policy to protect this area and we are shocked to see such a proposal using this wonderful green area we have around us. This will damage the eco system and wild life living in the Greenbelt which also works as a barrier between the town and a major road -A41.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8992
<b>Person ID</b>	1266948
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Keenan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed plan based on the following points:</p> <p>1 Numbers The proposed number of houses to build is based around a number initially “plucked from fresh air” and then revised using out of date ONS projections.</p> <p>2 Infrastructure Its is unclear what “amount” of open space will be available. With regard health - the surgery currently at Gossems End cannot cope with its current patient list - 2 week wait for a telephone appointment this is before the addition of new homes.</p> <p>3 Greenbelt All the development is on Greenbelt. The land between Shootersway and the A41 is considered of poorer quality, but it has always been regarded as Berkhamsted’s “Green Lung” absorbing emissions from the A41.</p> <p>4 Housing distribution Berkhamsted is set to grow by 25% but there is no consideration to constraints within the town (congestion, lack of public transport, lack of safe cycle ways etc).</p> <p>5 Sustainability The Sustainable transport plan is poor in respect of Berkhamsted - because the proposal to build is at the top of the hill, where car journeys are the only feasible transport for most. This isn’t very green and will then lead to further vehicle congestion in town,</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8993
<b>Person ID</b>	1266949
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Steve Woollett

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8994
<b>Person ID</b>	1266951
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Gill Birkett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am deeply Sorry to hear about the plans of building New Houses on Green area around Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Please Don't let this happen as it will Spoil our Lovely Countryside.</p> <p>The Houses will most definitely not be affordable housing anyway and our Children will never be able to afford the houses to live in the town where they grew up.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8995
<b>Person ID</b>	1266955
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms DEBORAH RODBARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to raise my objections to the draft local plan which appears to include a large number of new houses being built on the outskirts of Berkhamsted and Tring, most of which would be on green belt land.</p> <p>According to the NPPF, the stated purposes of green belt include (amongst others) checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and preserving the setting and character of historic towns.</p> <p>As well as these, provision of local, open, green space can help to protect against mental health problems, and stress related issues. This plan removes green belt areas that have become and are becoming increasingly popular walking/rambling routes and provide easy access to the wider countryside. Removing these areas will further increase the need to travel for recreational purposes.</p> <p>My understanding is that national planning policy states that green belt should not be developed except in 'exceptional circumstances'. The Council makes no effort to explain what the exceptional circumstances are in this borough. Furthermore, the growth proposed is neither sustainable nor respectful of the environmental role of planning. The increase in dwellings suggested in the plan fails to protect the historic character and setting of Berkhamsted and will increase the urban footprint through the release of green belt. It will also lead to the towns merging into one another.</p> <p>Has any research been undertaken into where these proposed new residents will work? Presumably there are not going to be hundreds of new jobs created in Berkhamsted or Northchurch, meaning that residents will be out of town workers or commuters. If indeed they are commuters, much of the planned development does not appear to be within walking</p>

distance of the railway station, meaning more congestion on our roads and increased levels of pollution. Berkhamsted already has a congestion problem and does not have a sustainable transport system. Building on steep valley sides and along ridge tops at a distance from facilities will exacerbate problems.

Whilst I understand the need for additional housing, I don't believe the excessive increases in the population and number of houses to be built over the next 18 years is sustainable. Adopting the proposals in the draft plan would result in substantial incursions into the precious green belt with adverse impact on parts of the AONB. We must build new homes, but we must do this with care and sensitivity for the environment, and the character of our existing communities. I don't believe the plan includes enough provision for traffic congestion, water and sewage capacity, medical and social care, or schools - certainly not how new schools would be funded.

As a resident of Berkhamsted, I hope that my objections are taken into account in this consultation.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8996

**Person ID** 1266967

**Full Name** Ms Patricia Whittle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8999
<b>Person ID</b>	1266975
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Norman Groves
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am sure you have had many responses in detail, many with great disappointment of the way this is going. To avoid giving you further reams of paper, instead I confirm that I endorse the detailed question-by-question responses submitted by two organisations, which I have read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkhamsted Town Council</li> <li>• Berkhamsted Citizens Association</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9007
<b>Person ID</b>	1266985
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Bryant
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

## Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment

In response to the consultation process, I am writing to formally note my OBJECTION to the Local Plan 2020 – 2038, 'Emerging Strategy for Growth'.

I have lived in Northchurch Parish for over 20 years and thus my objections are primarily based on my local area.

And as a resident of Northchurch, I am shocked and disappointed by the lack of attention to detail shown by the DBC officers who have compiled the Local Plan, whereby Northchurch does not appear to even be referenced in the Local Plan and is merely part of West Berkhamsted. This is just one example of the unprofessional, rushed, and ill-thought through approach taken in the Local Plan.

Specifically, I am objecting to the Local Plan on the grounds of:

- **Building on the Green Belt:**

The case for building on the Green Belt has not been presented. The Local Plan proposal is going against the protections established by the Government to protect the Green Belt and in this case, prevent the urban sprawl that would see the village of Northchurch become engulfed with Berkhamsted.

The Government states:

*“The fundamental aim of **Green Belt policy** is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of **Green Belts** are their openness and their permanence.”*

[Reference: Protecting Green Belt land - National Planning Policy Framework ...

[www.gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/13-protecting-green-belt-land) › guidance › 13-protecting-green-belt-land]

Building on the green belt fields between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane will see precious open green spaces lost forever and would dramatically transform the rural landscape of the green, valley hillsides that are characteristic of Northchurch.

- **Traffic gridlock:**

The huge housing developments proposed for Tring and Berkhamsted and the 400 houses planned for Northchurch will cause gridlock in Northchurch High Street as well as the B4506, New Road, which is a major route from Northchurch through Ashridge to Dunstable.

The 60 houses planned for the tiny strip of land at Lock Field on the B4506 is untenable: the small, single-track road that goes over the historic canal bridge is already overburdened by the current heavy levels of traffic.

- **Climate emergency issues have not been addressed:**

I believe climate change, biodiversity and well-being should be at the centre of the plan: they are not, despite the fact that Dacorum Borough Council declared a climate emergency. The Local Plan is prioritising economic growth and building on the green belt over considerations for the climate emergency. It has not taken into account legislation and recommendations from many organisations on how carbon reduction plans have to be a key, integral part of the development of local plans. In Northchurch, we are part of the Chilterns AONB and this should be respected and integrated into any plans.

- **Water supply and sewage systems**

The water table and water supply in Northchurch are already under huge pressure and the precious River Bulbourne chalk stream is already threatened. The extra housing proposed by the Local Plan would require substantial investment in infrastructure improvements in order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage and I do not believe this has been taken into account.

Thank you for registering my Objections to the Local Plan 2020 – 2038, ‘Emerging Strategy for Growth’

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9009

**Person ID** 1267005

**Full Name** Ms Kirsty Macdonald

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Northchurch and Berkhamsted I am completely opposed to the proposed plans of more than 2200 houses to be built in the area detailed in the strategy for growth local plan -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The number of houses proposed has been shown clearly by local groups to be more than are needed and our infrastructure will not support this plan.</li> <li>1 We will lose precious greenbelt in the area which will have a huge impact on the countryside and environment especially in the Northchurch/ canal site / river bulborne area.</li> <li>1 Northchurch itself is a small village already with a traffic problem. The centre and area around the school will be negatively impacted not to mention the ruin of a beautiful area with the wildlife around the canal and walks which would be compromised by the plans for the lock field site.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9018
<b>Person ID</b>	1267011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Louis Quail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Dacorum plan involves building 2200 houses in Just Berkhamsted and Northchurch alone most of it on Prime Green belt.</p> <p>This generation we are told need more housing but we and the next 50 or more) future generations also need :</p> <p>Open space</p>



Wellbeing  
 Bio diversity  
 Food security

I feel We need to ask tough questions about who will live in these new houses and why we can't have a more sophisticated solution to housing?

Developers love building on green belt because its easy and profitable but  
 Is it ok to give away our greenbelt so cheaply:

To build executive homes like Bearoc Park, for the benefit of landowners and developers and very few others is not great. Let's protect nature and stop urban sprawl.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9021
<b>Person ID</b>	1267011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Louis Quail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The transport study takes <i>no</i> account of Berkhamsted's geography and <u>valley</u> Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.</li> <li>• <i>No</i> significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.</li> <li>• No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes.</li> </ul>

- No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)
- The 'wildlife corridors' are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don't connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9022

**Person ID** 1267011

**Full Name** Mr Louis Quail

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** **Water**

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It's not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9023

**Person ID** 1267011

**Full Name** Mr Louis Quail

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Greenbelt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nearly all development proposed will be on Greenbelt. – this is <i>against</i> Government policy.</li> <li>The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. <u><i>A green buffer is needed.</i></u></li> <li>They should look at further Brownfield sites – as they are required to do.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9024
<b>Person ID</b>	1267011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Louis Quail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is nonsense. Berkhamsted is seen as ‘sustainable’ because it has (some) good facilities, despite the many constraints (hilly, congested main route through valley floor.) Most of the proposed building is at the top of the hill, where most people will rely on their cars for travel in and out of town. There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted’s traffic situation.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9025

<b>Person ID</b>	1267011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Louis Quail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Pollution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last but not least...Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.</li> <li>• Our town lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area.</li> <li>• I would strongly argue that the proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.</li> <li>• DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. <u><i>Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.</i></u></li> </ul> <p><b>Health and well-being are paramount to our communities. This Local Plan, if anything, will make life worse for those already living here and offer a congested, polluted, market town, stretched beyond its limits, to anyone thinking of moving here.</b></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9033
<b>Person ID</b>	1267022
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Germaine Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as objection to the many sites in and around Berkhamsted that are proposed for development. In my view, the infrastructure does not support development on this scale, and it will irreparably damage the charm and character of this lovely town and the countryside around it.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9036
<b>Person ID</b>	1267028
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Julie O'Sullivan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 In several of the recent years children in Berkhamsted have been unable to secure schooling within the town, both at primary and secondary level</li> <li>2 Traffic is frequently backed up along the High Street particularly going East where slow moving traffic usually extend to St Johns Lane with associated pollution</li> <li>3 Traffic is frequently backed up along the High Street particularly going East where slow moving traffic usually extend to St Johns Lane with associated pollution</li> <li>4 Traffic is also frequently backed up through Northchurch in both directions at different times of day with associated pollution.</li> <li>5 Traffic wishing to join the A41 is backed along Shootersway sometimes as far as Shootersway Park. New housing at Bearroc Park and that being built at Bearroc Park Stage 2 will add to this, with no viable alternative route, again adding to the pollution</li> </ol>

- 6 Access to local countryside is already at bursting point; car parks at Ashridge and other sites such as Gravel Pit at the top of New Road are so full at weekends that cars park on verges leading to degradation of the countryside.
- 7 I would also add that doctors surgeries are full up. It is extremely difficult to get a routine appointment, let alone an emergency one. This lack of infrastructure is of a concern.
- 1 Living in Berkhamsted I am particularly concerned about the impact on the town, not because it should be preserved above other areas of Dacorum but simply because I know of the existing issues.

Obviously some extra housing is required but the scale of that proposed is excessive. Furthermore the Plan seems to include little effort to infill smaller areas that could be redeveloped rather encroaching onto Green Belt.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9037

**Person ID** 1264335

**Full Name** Laura Clarke

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Sorry I could not find the form but please see my response below to Dacorum's Local Plan.

I have lived in Northchurch my whole life and am very worried about the proposed housing plans which threaten to destroy 21,000 acres of natural beauty, and so many fields near my house.

I have always loved living so close to the Green Belt, which my friends and I make use of every day. Access to this outdoor space is so important, not only for my physical health but also for my mental health. The Green Belt provides a calm and restorative environment, which helps to combat any stress whilst also boosting my wellbeing. Every lunchtime, without fail, I walk from my house across the fields to get exercise, fresh air and enjoy the views. It is so peaceful. I love hearing the sound of birds and seeing green, open spaces; all the stresses of work fade away and I feel refreshed. So, destroying this vital outdoor space will have a damaging effect not only on me but also on the spirit of the whole community.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9041
<b>Person ID</b>	1264335
<b>Full Name</b>	Laura Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I did a word-search to see how your plans would affect me, but Northchurch does not appear in your plan. You don't even have a plan for Northchurch. I believe these plans disregard the size not only of Northchurch but also the historic market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring, which will not sustain the number of houses proposed. Nobody I know thinks your plans make any sense.</p> <p>I am not set in my political views, but all my friends feel the same as me – we will not vote for anyone who supports destroying the Green Belt in order to build more than twice as many houses as Dacorum needs.</p> <p>I really hope you will take these comments on board.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9045
<b>Person ID</b>	1267059
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifically on my home area of Berkhamsted, when the A41 was built the intention was for much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides. In addition, the Thakeham / Broxbourne proposed development which is in addition to the housing development plan under consideration here will complete an urban conurbation from Northchurch to Kings Langley, destroying any wildlife corridors along this strip, which also goes against any 'special circumstances' for developing green belt.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9058
<b>Person ID</b>	1267064
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE SAUNDERS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9077
<b>Person ID</b>	1267067
<b>Full Name</b>	KATHRYN BROWN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy: It seems that the policy to build on Green Belt land first, rather than using the brownfield and urban sites, must be developer led with larger profits in mind. Is this really going to go unchallenged?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9079
<b>Person ID</b>	1267069
<b>Full Name</b>	Cathy Edmunds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9080
<b>Person ID</b>	1267070

<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Barham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9098
<b>Person ID</b>	1267075
<b>Full Name</b>	MICHAEL JAMES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The following are my principal objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The figures for the amount of housing throughout the whole of Dacorum, appear incorrect. The Council is using outdated (2014) housing projections. The overall number of houses proposed throughout the Borough - 16899, is</li> </ol>

just not justified by the latest statistics on projected growth. There is also the question that these houses will be executive in nature and there will be limited social housing.

- 2 Loss of Green Belt land and the impact this will have on mental and physical wellbeing. The ability to walk from your house, without using a car to a green space, is vital for wellbeing as well as the environment. This was illustrated during this past year during lockdown. Personally, as a Northchurch resident the countryside by the A41 and the fields by Bell and Darrs Lane, prove to be so important during this time. Not forgetting, these areas have an abundant array of wildlife and I believe, ancient woodlands. It would be a travesty to build over this. I would like to remind DBC that the Law states we can only build on Green Belt land if proven necessary - this does not appear to be the case in this proposal. I also remember when the A41 was proposed, these green corridors would be left, undisturbed, as a "green lung" absorbing emissions from the A41. The proposed number of houses could be built on Brownfield land in the existing urban areas of Hemel Hempstead, Tring, Berkhamsted and Kings Langley and not on Green Belt land and the Chilterns AONB.
- 3 Loss of Northchurch's Identity. Northchurch has not even been referred to in the proposal, but appears to be renamed as "West Berkhamsted". Northchurch is very much its own community and village, separate from Berkhamsted. With two churches, a pub, shops and a thriving cricket club, I am proud of its history, but this proposal appears to rename it as well as threaten to lose its charm and community feeling with an over provision of housing.
- 4 Infrastructure. The sheer volume of housing will have a knock-on effect to every town. The massive development in Tring and Berkhamsted as well as the proposed housing in Northchurch, will create a gridlock in the narrow Northchurch High street. There are no plans for playing areas or football pitches. Where will the children go to play? There are no plans for additional health services, our Doctors Surgeries are already over stretched.
- 5 Pollution. Poor Air quality has been noted in Northchurch and Berkhamsted. Most residents live along the valley and towards the bottom and up the sides and air pollution naturally collects in this area. Development proposed on this scale will only result in further air pollution, affecting those with asthma and respiratory conditions the worse.
- 6 Water, Sewage and Waste Disposal. As a resident who lives in the valley, our road is prone to flooding. The drainage system already appears strained and I worry the volume of houses will only add to the fragile system in place already.

I am not against housing and especially building affordable homes. It is, however, the sheer volume of housing and loss of countryside and community with a lack of planning, that I object to in this proposal. We are custodians of our environment and countryside for future generations. It would be catastrophic to lose all this precious countryside on our watch, as it can never be replaced.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9099

**Person ID** 1145838

**Full Name** Mr Keith Bradbury

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9105
<b>Person ID</b>	1267074
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanne Howe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9112
<b>Person ID</b>	1267079
<b>Full Name</b>	Jack Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9117
<b>Person ID</b>	1145026
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Margaret Pillinger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having read through the plans for Berkhamsted, I should like to raise the following objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 So much will involve building on green belt land.</li> <li>2 The town is already struggling and will not be able to absorb 992 new houses.</li> <li>3 I acknowledge that we need affordable housing, but how affordable will they be and to which category of purchaser? We already have too many 5 bedroom executive houses.!</li> <li>4 The infrastructure is inadequate, insufficient numbers of schools, doctors, dentists., 5. What about the additional utilities, water, sewerage and power?</li> <li>5 Traffic movement and parking is already a nightmare around the town. The effect of the extra residents and their cars will lead to more gridlock.</li> <li>6 Many towns are moving towards emission free zones, all this extra traffic will pollute the atmosphere.</li> <li>7 The plan to put 150 houses on Haslam field will lead to gridlock - just imagine an extra 150 cars on Shootersway at rush hour!</li> </ol> <p>I hope that there will be a rethink of this plan, which seems to me will destroy our town!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9124
<b>Person ID</b>	399320
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Simon Jackson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing this with a Berkhamsted slant as it's a place I know and have been resident in for 55 years. However I am very confident that my concerns will also be applicable to ALL other communities detailed for growth in your report.</p> <p>In Berkhamsted ,with existing population of approximately 18,000 , your proposal is proposing an extra 2,200 homes with a possible increase of residents of 8,000+. This is theoretically a not small 42% increase with potential for disastrous consequences for the area.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL</p>

The Dacorum area and surrounding areas are as you well know a fantastic place to live and visit. The area boasts many unique flora and fauna species not found anywhere else in the country. Uncontrolled development and increase in residents will not doubt have a huge impact on the biodiversity of the area ,as in many other parts of the UK, and to lose further species in unacceptable. All areas such as Green Belt,AONB , National Trust, Wildlife Trusts, Conservation areas should NOT be subject to development and all other areas developed with nature and upmost priority.

As we have seen during COVID green spaces have been a saviour for our physical and mental well-being.

I feel all developments must use existing brownfield sites and soon to be redundant office spaces.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

This is a big potential problem for the both the Dacorum community and Council Services alike.

Over the years I have seen the population of Berkhamsted probably double with new estates, infill projects etc. This has resulted in the following A). Severe congestion in the town with the associated degradation in air quality.

- 1 B) Overcrowded doctors surgeries and lack of resource for social/ mental healthcare for many who do not have the financial resources to go “ private”
- 2 C) Over crowded schools with parents having to fight for places for their children in schools that can provide them with competent education for the future.
- 3 D) Severe pressure of utilities especially water which we have seen in recent years ,even with the existing population levels , become a problem.
- 4 E) Increases in noise, poor air quality ,litter and for some anti social behaviour.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9126
<b>Person ID</b>	1267101
<b>Full Name</b>	Barbara Markovic
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wish to state that I oppose the draft local plan as it makes no allowance for the difficulties in use of narrow roads and steep hills to reach the main shopping area and transport links from the planned developments. I also object to the use of valuable Green Belt land.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9127
<b>Person ID</b>	1267104
<b>Full Name</b>	H Penny
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9128
<b>Person ID</b>	1267103
<b>Full Name</b>	T Penny
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i>  <i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9129
<b>Person ID</b>	1267102
<b>Full Name</b>	S Penny
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i>  <i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9135
<b>Person ID</b>	1267109
<b>Full Name</b>	Laurie Maclaren

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed local plan and the specifically the South Berkhamsted concept. I believe it will ruin the historic town of Berkhamsted. The amount of housing earmarked is far too much. The infrastructure in berkhamsted will not cope. It seems badly conceived and thought out.</p> <p>The area which to all but the Council is known as Green Belt and most of it on the outskirts of Berkhamsted and Tring. In arriving at this decision the Council have ignored national Planning Policy contained in the NPPF and statements by Ministers including the PM that Green Belt should not be developed except in 'exceptional circumstances'. The Council makes no effort to explain what the exceptional circumstances are in this Borough. The Council's proposals are neither justifiable or sustainable and this is the core of my opposition to this draft Plan. DBC should revert to the Core Strategy vision statement.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9137
<b>Person ID</b>	1144714
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Stuart Reid
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to beg that the ludicrous plan to build all over south Berkhamsted is rejected. It is based on flawed data and fails to consider</p> <p>1 Loss of green belt forever.</p>

- 2 Too many houses for what the infrastructure can handle.
- 3 Loss of wildlife forever.
- 4 Wrong type of housing.
- 5 People no longer are as dependent on commuting. Hence demand to live here is not growth of >20%.
- 6 Local views are being trampled on.

This plan is destructive. For the planet, and for well-being.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9138

**Person ID** 1267114

**Full Name** Stephen Williamson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9139

**Person ID** 1267115

**Full Name** Sarah Wiggs

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9142
<b>Person ID</b>	1267119
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>firstly let me preface this with an understanding that houses are needed and have to be built somewhere and ultimately no one wants their surrounding area to change as ultimately they chose to live in that place because of how was at the time of purchase. Should the development go ahead, new potential purchasers will have the same considerations.</p> <p>That said, with the current pandemic, it has given us all more time to reflect on where and how we live. Walking around Berkhamsted town centre, the 1970s shops were right for the time but I am sure they wouldn't be given planning permission now as they don't enhance the centre but were a functional solution. I believe the same of the proposed development... it is a functional solution but in the long-run won't be regarded by future generations as the best possible solution. Green belt is there for the good of nature and people - never before has it been more important for people to be able to access</p>

open spaces and places to walk. The arguments with regard to access, infrastructure etc. are well documented so I don't need to refer to them... I just believe there needs to be some 'blue sky thinking' with regard to this. Go bold, develop new towns rather than overdevelop existing ones. I have children who will need flats/houses but a new town with its own infrastructure is the right place for them and many others... we can't keep on adding to the existing as it will reach an unsustainable point. We need to think bigger and wider and not wreck what we already have and won't be able to get back.

Please listen to the locals and think of more radical solutions rather than wrecking something that deserves to be preserved.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9143

**Person ID** 1267121

**Full Name** Hilary Hartley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I'm a resident of Berkhamsted as such I'm against much of the draft Local Plan for Berkhamsted, specifically against Draft Local Plan Section 23.1. The reasons for this are:

- 1 Quite a number of sites appear to be on green belt land. I don't believe we should be eroding this very important protection of our countryside.
- 2 A high number of people move to and live in Berkhamsted to use the train, mainly to London. Nearly all these sites are a long way from the station and on the other side of the High Street to the station. There appears to be no proposed transport solutions for this, for instance, an improved low cost/free bus services to coordinate with trains (ie. an integrated transport solution). As a result this will considerably increase traffic in the town centre.
- 3 Its not clear how the two plots on either side of Swingate Lane (SL) will connect to the A41. If the new residents have to go through the town centre this will also drive up traffic congestion. If the plan is to connect to A41 via the plots west of SL, traffic from the plot east of SL and from that end of Berkhamsted will pass through the plots west of SL creating a 'Rat Run' through the new residential area increasing the road traffic danger to children and air and noise pollution levels for all.

- 4 As with point 2 above many of these site are a long way for other facilities, for instance large food shops, doctors, dentists, pharmacists, churches, restaurants, bars, public buildings etc. So to access these facilities virtually all trips will be by car.
- 5 For affordable housing (which is proposed to be 40%) car ownership is lower and with no or poor public transport this could leave a significant minority isolated. For many of these sites eg. all the sites along the side of the A41 there are no bus services, the hills are too steep to cycle and too far for most to walk.
- 6 Many of the sites are directly alongside the busy A41, in the prevailing wind direction of the road with virtually no protection from trees or embankments. As such houses there will suffer considerable noise and air pollution.
- 7 I'm against the Shootersway Playing Fields being built on. The pandemic has highlighted the valuable role that exercise plays in healthy living and we should preserve every space we can for children and adults to exercise on. This plot should be removed from the plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9162

**Person ID** 211352

**Full Name** Mr Andrew Sanderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I quote from BRAG's excellent summary "Policy SP1 really isn't worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Master plans to the detriment of both the development and community , while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as "successful new communities", "best approach to", "best practice", "comprehensive green infrastructure", "multifunctional space", "an exemplar in sustainable living" etc. etc. etc. BRAG particularly takes issue with "5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy." As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted, while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport."

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9174
<b>Person ID</b>	1267159
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON HILLIER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am strongly opposed to the development as proposed in the plan. I believe that the plans will over-develop the town and will have detrimental impact on current and future residents. I do not believe our historic market town has the infrastructure to support the plans.</p> <p>The proposed housing will cause us to lose green-belt land which is enjoyed by residents for leisure activities and will destroy the beautiful landscape and nature that we have. As a keen runner and a walker with my family, we gain a lot of benefit from the natural area. As a parent, I have concerns that my children will not have the natural beauty of the area to grow up in.</p> <p>The proposal and development will cause increased traffic, particularly along Swing Gate which is home to two primary schools. I believe this would be dangerous for the pupils of those schools that enjoy the freedom of walking to school as well as adding congestion, noise, air pollution to an already traffic-heavy town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9177
<b>Person ID</b>	1160475
<b>Full Name</b>	Bev Mckenna
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This is my formal response and objection to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>I have gone through all 400-plus pages of the Emerging Strategy documents as well as the maps, the appendices, the appraisal documents (and have additionally looked at aerial photographs which revealed much to me) and I have looked at the virtual exhibition.</p> <p>With that, I have gone through the full consultation response and I wholeheartedly support the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group's full response to the consultation. Accordingly, and to avoid full repetition of their responses, kindly please accept this as confirmation that I wish the Dacorum Borough Council to duplicate the responses made by the BRAG under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9178
<b>Person ID</b>	1265013
<b>Full Name</b>	Naomi Wood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I writing to express our objection the thousands of proposed extra homes in Berkhamsted and the consumption of greenbelt land.</p> <p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p>



The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name and my partners name.

My personal points are:

As a Northchurch resident we are concerned to how many acres of green belt will be lost and how much the local population will increase? These new houses will overwhelm the already stretched local services (no hospital, no police station and oversubscribed schools) and the thousands of extra vehicle journeys will negatively impact congestion, road traffic collisions and air quality. Already the junction in Northchurch of New road and the High Street is already dangerous and busy, the extra houses will make this worse, also the junction of Darrs Lane and the High Street already gets congested so hundreds of new houses will only make this worse and dangerous. The High Street/Tring Road is a dangerous road, which is a concern when I have a young child, many cars drive far too fast through Northchurch and the extra houses will only increase the amount of road users using these roads.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9181

**Person ID** 1267162

**Full Name** A WALKER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I writing to express our objection the thousands of proposed extra homes in Berkhamsted and the consumption of greenbelt land.

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name and my partners name.

My personal points are:

As a Northchurch resident we are concerned to how many acres of green belt will be lost and how much the local population will increase? These new houses will overwhelm the already stretched local services (no hospital, no police station and oversubscribed schools) and the thousands of extra vehicle journeys will negatively impact congestion, road traffic collisions and air quality. Already the junction in Northchurch of New road and the High Street is already dangerous and busy, the extra houses will make this worse, also the junction of Darrs Lane and the High Street already gets congested so hundreds of new houses will only make this worse and dangerous. The High Street/Tring Road is a dangerous road, which is a concern when I have a young child, many cars drive far too fast through Northchurch and the extra houses will only increase the amount of road users using these roads.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9183

**Person ID**

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9184

<b>Person ID</b>	1267169
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs IRENE MCCALL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9186
<b>Person ID</b>	1267170
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Victoria Drummond
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to submit my objection to the proposed local plan. In particular the impact to West Berkhamsted is disproportionate, I also have a specific concern that the impact to Shootersway Lane has not been considered, whilst this is a private road, the increase in traffic is inevitable and unfair given the road is maintained by the residents. I would

be grateful if this could be added into the scope of consideration/proposed impact and adequate support provided to the residents of this road to mitigate incremental traffic/users of the lane.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9189

**Person ID** 1267172

**Full Name** Ms Jennifer Hackett

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I wish to comment on the plan mentioned above, the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) . This indicates a huge amount of development in Berkhamsted and Northchurch. The population would be hugely increased and the towns totally changed. The amount of development mentioned would completely change the character of these areas. This alone is against the planning and development guidelines. Looking deeper, it seems that the plan is already out of date. It is based on the guidance rules of 2014 with no adjustment for Green Belt and AONB implications. These changes reduce the number of dwellings to be built. The guidance was revised in 2018, and using these up-to-date guidelines produces a much smaller number of houses – about half of that proposed. Allowance must be made for these alterations to the guidance rules.

In my view this lack of attention to the updated guidelines mean that the current plan should be rejected and re-formulated using the new guidelines.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9191

<b>Person ID</b>	1267186
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sylvia Webster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Writing as a resident of Berkhamsted, I consider that the any encroachment of replacement of currently Green Belt land beyond the boundary where Durrants Lane meets Shooters Way Berkhamsted would be a tragic loss from the environmental point of view of cherished rural countryside which is currently designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>The Durrants Lane/Shooters Way junction should be designated as a line beyond which no further new housing or other premises should be envisaged.</p> <p>Dacorum's vision for the future of Berkhamsted appears to prefer reckless large scale housing development to the preservation of Green Belt countryside. With Climate Change in mind, we should not be generating more carbon footprint and traffic movements which would result from further dense housing development.</p> <p>Instead, bearing in mind the emerging effect that the pandemic has had on the way the local population manage their lives, (for example working from home, less use of the railway and less use of cars), fresh thinking is needed in relation to future Planning Strategy.</p> <p>It may be that the use of existing infill pockets and/or redundant areas within the existing urban and residential curtilage of Berkhamsted could fulfil future housing demand. This would invigorate the town without sacrificing precious Green Belt land.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9195
<b>Person ID</b>	1267193

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Keith Vanessa Gill & Harrison
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'd like to oppose these developments completely,</p> <p>Firstly, the way the proposal was sent out at a time when the lockdown kicked in, and all hell was breaking loose stinks of a hidden agenda, the web site for information seems designed to misinform, and its being marketed as a boost to Berkhamsted's sporting? It's full of distraction, smoke and mirrors!</p> <p>It's clearly a commercial land grab without the consideration and environment impact assessments, trying to trick the local communities into thinking its benefitting them.</p> <p>Secondly, Berkhamsted's infrastructure can't handle an increase, never mind the substantial increase that's already from the Swing Gate Lane developments, the traffic along that route has increased significantly with no improvements, potholes are increasing exponentially along the route between there and the high street, and nothing has been done (what a surprise) so now we get into the high street itself, pre-lockdown the high street traffic was truly awful, with major tailbacks stretching in all directions, with a significant pollution impact to the surrounding area during these times, then there's the parking, yes we've got a new multi-storey, but the fact of life is people will seek out free parking around the high street, I used to live on Manor street and it's already a nightmare to park down there, people from this new development will exasperate this.</p> <p>Simply put, It just won't fit.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9198
<b>Person ID</b>	1267194

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Miranda Heck
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to respond to the proposed Dacorum Local Plan. I have lived in Northchurch for 20 years, married and brought up 2 children here, I am dismayed at the proposed building of hundreds of houses which will damage our way of life, our safety and the environment.</p> <p>Northchurch has its own distinct character, its own community, its own Parish council, its own history and its own countryside. Being referred to as West Berkhamsted in these proposals denies our individuality in an attempt to disregard the value of our “village” identity.</p> <p>It is undeniable that there is a national need for more affordable housing and of course we cannot all adopt a ‘not on my doorstep’ attitude. However we equally should not blindly accept proposed mass building and the destruction of our local green belt without serious consideration of the way the numbers are calculated and the selection of suitable sites. In the case of these proposed plans, it appears the numbers have been derived firstly by a now discarded inaccurate algorithm and more recently by irrelevant and outdated statistics from 2014, when I understand more recent 2018 data is available? There is at the very least a need for clarity and transparency in the matter.</p> <p>The potential use of alternative brown field sites must surely be fully considered before we irrevocably destroy our precious countryside. Disused buildings and land can be regenerated and in the age of Covid with businesses folding and more employees working from home the potential for repurposing buildings in the coming years is surely relevant?</p> <p>The impact of the increase in road traffic on our already dangerous local roads doesn’t bear thinking about. Traffic increasing on New Road, over the narrow canal bridge, past our village primary school is a frightening prospect. I witness on almost a daily basis the very real danger to small children of congestion in the High Street and New Road with speeding cars and narrow pavements when children make their way to school. The resulting increase in pollution and poor air quality should also not be overlooked.</p>

Darrs Lane is also narrow, with poor visibility and is another major cause for concern. Similarly Bell Lane could simply not cope with the massive increase in traffic flow.

In addition, the local infrastructure could not cope. The local shops in Northchurch, predominantly Tesco, with very limited provision already cause dangerous parking all around, especially along Darrs Lane where people park increasingly further away from Tesco essentially narrowing Darrs Lane to a single lane. If the proposed expansion of Tring also goes ahead this will be further exacerbated by increased traffic along the High Street and people “popping in” to Northchurch Tesco.

I have also become aware of the threat to our chalk stream the Bulbourne. The increased strain on our water supply would threaten our river. The flow is already depleted and when caused to run dry by additionally supporting the water supply, irreparable damage is caused to our plants and wildlife. It is heart breaking to think the delightful clear stream that runs through our school grounds, that our school children value and clear rubbish from to protect it, which has been a part of my children’s life is under threat. Chalk streams need to be protected for our children’s future.

The countryside which is a part of and surrounds Northchurch must be preserved. Our hedgerows, our fields, are home to an array of flora and fauna. We are a village nestled in a valley with lovely views of the countryside. At present the many dog walkers, myself included are able to walk from home. If we have a sprawl of housing eating up our green spaces more will be forced to drive out to neighbouring spots, again increasing traffic and pollution.

I urge you to reconsider the numbers and the proposed sites before our way of life and our countryside is irrevocably damaged.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9201
<b>Person ID</b>	494912
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anna French
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am emailing you to express my objections to the proposed development outlined in Dacorum Borough Council's document: Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 – 2038).</p> <p>As a resident of Berkhamsted, and part of the wider Dacorum communities, I request that DBC reconsider this plan. The plan will severely impact the green belt and the areas AONB status which are key to the areas feel and also Berkhamsted's market town history. The whole area will be affected adversely by these over developments.</p> <p>I would like to say that I fully support the BRAG objections, but I would like to make the additional points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The loss of essential green spaces is irrevocable and brown field sites which now have special planning status should be considered. The decline in the demand for high street retail and the reduction in the requirement for large out-of-town retail spaces over the last few years means there should be a rethink on how these spaces could be used for housing, instead of building on precious green belt areas. Once these areas are lost, the habitat can never be recaptured.</li> <li>2 The expansion planned in Berkhamsted along Shootersway will cause terrible congestion and greatly increase the traffic on residential streets (for example, Durrant's lane, Cross Oak Road, Bell Lane, Darr's Lane) that are completely unsuitable for heavy traffic flow. Despite the new traffic lights at the top of Kings Road and Shootersway, this junction (pre-pandemic) was already very congested at peak times and this is before the completion of the Bearroc park development.</li> <li>3 The current infrastructure (roads, schools, doctors, parking, water supply) cannot cope with this huge increase in population. Infrastructure in Berkhamsted is struggling already - for example, the water supply relies on chalk aquifers, these draw water away from the borough's three chalk rivers which are classified as priority habitats under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.</li> </ol> <p>I hope that DBC will take note of the electorate that vote them in to power and listen to and address their concerns by significantly reducing the development plans, and preserving our precious green belt.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9202
<b>Person ID</b>	494912

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anna French
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to say that I fully support the BRAG objections.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9204
<b>Person ID</b>	1267199
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Ian and Jane Sayle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Over the 20 years we have lived in Berkhamsted we have seen various developments and change. The most significant impact has been the increase in traffic specifically along the highstreet. We live on (address removed) going out of town towards Northchurch, it is alarming how often a queue forms running from Gossoms End into the centre of town and if there has been an incident on the A41 you can expect the queue to run from the centre of town right along through Northchurch.</p> <p>The proposed housing on the top edge of the valley is of great concern, we feel the increase in traffic with cause even greater congestion than we already have and pollution levels along the highstreet and some side roads will be dangerously high, we already feel the pollution in town has reached unsafe levels. Due to the geographical nature of Berkhamsted</p>

we cannot see car alternatives working for those residents based at the top edge of the valley, they WILL drive into town to do their shopping, take children to school, go to the station, etc in order to avoid the walk back up the hill.

When you look at the map of Berkhamsted it is glaringly obvious the lack of trunk roads to move additional traffic through and around the town.

Also, the map highlights the lack of green parkland in the town. The fields and areas of natural beauty around the town are of immense importance to residents, they are areas well used to walk and exercise we cannot afford to lose anymore green areas from this already densely populated town and we cannot afford to increase the already high levels of carbon emissions!

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9226

**Person ID** 1267252

**Full Name** Ms Kathleen Fawle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am opposed to the Dacorum housing plan for Berkhamsted on the following grounds:

The plan to build 100s of houses close to the A41 will have major health impacts on the residents as a result of pollution from the dual carriageway.

The plan should be revisited in light of the COVID crisis, it is expected that, post pandemic living close to London will no longer be such an attractive proposition as a result of the digital transformation which will eliminate the need to commute. Any development proposals should wait until the national impact of this has been fully assessed.

The need for sport facilities, health centres and schooling to cater for the increase in population has not been fully thought through.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9227
<b>Person ID</b>	1264686
<b>Full Name</b>	Suzanne Doubleday
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I could respond point by point to your document, however I'm a carer of [SENSITIVE INFO REMOVED] and I don't have the time. However, I am in full support of BRAG's carefully created response, in every point. I do not want any more destruction of green belt land anywhere in Britain, but especially in and around our historic town.</p> <p>No amount of schools, shops or sports facilities will EVER make up for destroying the beautiful countryside and the natural habitat of many animals around Berkhamsted. It's a travesty it's even been mooted, and a disgrace that DBC are considering it.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9239
<b>Person ID</b>	1264686
<b>Full Name</b>	Suzanne Doubleday
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9246
<b>Person ID</b>	1267266
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Tony Dempsey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to strongly record my objections to the above plan for the areas in and around Berkhamsted due to the following reasons.</p> <p>The numbers are wrong. The formula used or algorithm was changed, and best is questionable. Proposal is to build far too many new homes.</p> <p>The impact to Berkhamsted and surrounds is far too great and will have a detrimental impact to our quality of life, increased pollution, road noise, light pollution, and many other areas.</p> <p>The area would be forced to endure a significant amount of road noise and its subsequent road safety concerns.</p> <p>The loss of green belt land will have serious ecological implications for generations to come.</p>

The requirement to build huge developments of new infrastructure will impact everything from local biodiversity to road pollutions to increased levels of cars in the area.

Please would you record my objections.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9250

**Person ID** 1267273

**Full Name** Mr DANIEL GARROD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9251

**Person ID** 1267277

**Full Name** Mrs LOUISE GARROD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9254
<b>Person ID</b>	1267289
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms JULIE TOLLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9255
<b>Person ID</b>	1267291
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms CHARLOTTE WOOLLETT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9262
<b>Person ID</b>	1267329
<b>Full Name</b>	MARTIN DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small



community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9273

**Person ID** 1267330

**Full Name** Kat Worth

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** —The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough

is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.

— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9293
<b>Person ID</b>	1267333
<b>Full Name</b>	JO MURPHY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9314
<b>Person ID</b>	1267332
<b>Full Name</b>	Nandi Jordan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Berkhamsted and Tring Labour Party
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two</p>

towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring. The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9327

**Person ID** 485614

**Full Name** Mrs Verna Burgess

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have to reply by email as the online portal you requested be used simply did not work and is not fit for purpose. In summary I am appalled at the proposals for Berkhamsted and I support the responses by BRAG 100% as listed below (SEE BRAG RESPONSE). I am particularly not convinced that any affordable housing will be provided that is within the range of wage earners doing normal jobs in Berkhamsted and Tring. My son earns £20k so please demonstrate to me what housing within the plan will be remotely affordable for him. I think that in this time of COVID where public access to information and officers has been so restricted that the process should be extended to allow for full public meetings.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9330

<b>Person ID</b>	1267345
<b>Full Name</b>	ALEXANDRA FRENCH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9332
<b>Person ID</b>	1267348
<b>Full Name</b>	EMMA BRADBURY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9333

**Person ID** 484179

**Full Name** Mr John Humphrey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** This email is my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, please accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9334

**Person ID** 1267353

**Full Name** David Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9364
<b>Person ID</b>	1267367
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>— There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p>

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9378

**Person ID** 1267368

**Full Name** Peter Leighton-Murray

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.



—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9392

**Person ID** 1267370

**Full Name** Patricia Beloe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9402
<b>Person ID</b>	1259485
<b>Full Name</b>	Gail Skelton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I cannot actually believe that this proposal such as it currently is, is genuinely being considered within this area of our once lovely town. I already had my concerns about the additional noise and traffic alongside my home and will be directly affected by this proposal. The pavements on Shootersway are already dangerous as they are not wide enough for pedestrians and I think we have been fortunate that there have not been more injuries or fatalities, particularly for children making their way to school.</p> <p>This whole proposal is not acceptable in its current form and needs to be halted immediately.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9417
<b>Person ID</b>	1267392
<b>Full Name</b>	TANYA VERBEEK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9420
<b>Person ID</b>	1267393
<b>Full Name</b>	MARGARET VAUGHTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to object to the proposed housing development as Berkhamsted does not have the infrastructure to support it. Witness pre-covid traffic jams, speeding through villages, pot holes etc.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9421
<b>Person ID</b>	1266841
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael French
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9437
<b>Person ID</b>	1263875
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa Greenfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Whilst I acknowledge the need for more housing, particularly affordable housing, I reject the proposal for the south Berkhamsted complex. I reject this on the basis that the historical and often crowded town, in my opinion, lacks the infrastructure to cope with such a huge increase of housing and that precious green belt should remain protected.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9440
<b>Person ID</b>	1267398
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra and James Donaldson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p>

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9442

**Person ID** 1267400

**Full Name** MICHELLE LYONS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  
The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9452

**Person ID** 1267401

**Full Name** JACKIE BELLAMY

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</li> <li><b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</li> <li>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</li> <li>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</li> <li>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</li> <li>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</li> <li>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9472
<b>Person ID</b>	1267417

<b>Full Name</b>	Wendy and Paul Goodridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9480
<b>Person ID</b>	1267417
<b>Full Name</b>	Wendy and Paul Goodridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p> <p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance</p>



from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9496

**Person ID** 399324

**Full Name** Ms Julie Hollway

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Input as requested during the Consultation to the proposed Dacorum Local Plan. (I use email as the Portal is way too cumbersome for people to use!)

I am a local resident in Northchurch and moved to the area given its rural nature and views over Green Belt (which I and the government want to protect). To ruin this will be to ruin the whole environment we live in and bring consequences we cannot reverse when we realise the error of our ways. Now is the time to protect where we live .. not suffer death by a thousand cuts to our beautiful and healthy environment.

Dacorum is blessed with significant areas of Green Belt countryside, and market towns rich in history. Those towns and countryside offer significant amenities and benefits to residents. However, it is also an area which lacks significant infrastructure. There is no large hospital within the borough; the train service into London is already at capacity (Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, p.76 - see [https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-local-plan-interim-sustainability-appraisal-report-appendices-november-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6abe0c9e\\_4](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-local-plan-interim-sustainability-appraisal-report-appendices-november-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6abe0c9e_4)), there are air pollution concerns (Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, p.22.), schools are full, and roads are increasingly clogged.

I am specifically interested in this response to how the proposed Local Plan affects land between Bell Lane, Shootersway, Darrs Lane and Grenville Road: known as "The Wishing Tree Field" or BK06 (East of Darrs Lane).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9508

**Person ID** 399324

**Full Name** Ms Julie Hollway

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** SP22 ("Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted") is not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3. ("West Berkhamsted" is essentially Northchurch, a village.)

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9513

**Person ID** 1267422

<b>Full Name</b>	Rebecca Farquharson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9517
<b>Person ID</b>	1267424
<b>Full Name</b>	Laura Goss
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Re:-Objection to Dacorum Local Consultation Plan - NORTHCHURCH</p> <p>The removal of Green Belt Status.</p>

This land has the PROTECTION OF GREEN BELT and SHOULD NOT BE BUILT ON.

We do not have sufficient hospitals for the area now that Hemel Hempstead has been close. For ambulances to get to Watford is very difficult as the A41 bypass (that you are will be adding extra traffic from all the new developments you are proposing) does not have a hard shoulder and therefore very difficult to get through especially at the end where it meets the traffice lights and M25 roundabout. We need a NEW HOSPITAL.

Two fields adjacent to proposed development in Shooters Way have been lost in the last 3 YEARS

It has become extremely difficult to get a doctors/dentist appointment due to increased numbers of people that have now moved into the area as Northchurch doesn't have a doctors surgery or dentist. Schools are also already over subscribed. Berkhamsted roads especially the town is under so much pressure constantly. This is not being seen at the present time as people are not travelling to work school etc because of the pandemic so the full picture cannot be assed until things return to normal.

I was borne in Northchurch and have attended st marys school. It is a lovely village to grow up in because its small close knit these extra developments will be adding almost a third more population and will loose its own identity and just become an add on to Berkhamsted.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9523

**Person ID** 1267428

**Full Name** Susan Parsons

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9533
<b>Person ID</b>	1267427
<b>Full Name</b>	Megan Humphreys
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9538
<b>Person ID</b>	398872
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Barrett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to inform you that I utterly disagree with the Local Plan and in particular with the housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>I consider that the housing numbers proposed are excessive and unrealistically high in the light of local needs and potential for employment. For example, recent major developments to the west of the town ... e.g. Bearroc Park .. are already impacting the infrastructure such as roads, schools and doctor surgeries. Greatly increased traffic on Shootersway is now at an unacceptably dangerous level for pedestrians and cyclists; equally air and noise pollution significantly impacts adversely on local residents.</p> <p>I also believe that whatever plan is eventually adopted must specify exactly the order in which land should be released for development to provide a coherent development programme facilitating the provision of local infrastructure such as schools, shops and transport links and of course essential social housing. Developers should not be permitted to acquire develop land across the town on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>For this reason I believe that the Bulbourne Cross proposals represent a logical and acceptable way to provide for the possibility of building additional homes and infrastructure for the town and should be fully considered by the planning authority.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9545
<b>Person ID</b>	1267432
<b>Full Name</b>	David Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifically on my home area of Berkhamsted, when the A41 was built the intention was for much of the land currently proposed for development to be retained as a 'green lung' to buffer the town from the A41. This development will now remove this area, along with the wildlife corridor that it provides. In addition, the Thakeham / Broxbourne</li> </ul>

proposed development which is in addition to the housing development plan under consideration here will complete an urban conurbation from Northchurch to Kings Langley, destroying any wildlife corridors along this strip, which also goes against any 'special circumstances' for developing green belt.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9549

**Person ID** 1267433

**Full Name** John McDonough

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- 1 There has clearly been a lack of thinking and understanding on much of the plan including moving ERS to Bridgewater. As a minimum, the unintended consequences are so significant, including traffic, pollution and road safety and the effect it will have on people's wellbeing, I would like to understand whether this work was done inhouse or outsourced to a consultancy, as it looks like it is a theoretical exercise which has not taken reality into account.
- 2 Northchurch is a beautiful part of the world and has to remain so. Building increasing numbers of housing estates on greenbelt land will ruin it. No one can realistically expect houses not to be built, but trying to load them in the manner here has no justification except for the convenience and profit of developers. The council is not there to facilitate this.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9563

**Person ID** 1264246

**Full Name** Steve Burdekin

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As Berkhamsted is a valley it makes it less appealing to cycle and walk and the use of cars will be greater adding to the already dangerous levels of pollution, especially as we see an increased ageing population.</p> <p>The natural valley that Berkhamsted sits in makes it a holding pen for pollution so any increased particles will disperse slower.</p> <p>The land between the top end of Berkhamsted and the A41 was created as buffer zone for absorbing traffic pollution. This is unhealthy and damaging to peoples health considering the increased volume over the years.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9569
<b>Person ID</b>	1267443
<b>Full Name</b>	Sergio Quezada
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9577
<b>Person ID</b>	1267449
<b>Full Name</b>	Jennie Peachey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9588
<b>Person ID</b>	1267453
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Light
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9589

**Person ID** 1267454

**Full Name** Sharon Letherman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am responding to Dacorum's Local Plan Emerging strategy for growth (2020 -2038).

I strongly object to these plans and they should not go ahead.

I oppose to any proposed dwellings in the Green Belt in Berkhamsted.

The Town has become overcrowded, there isn't the infrastructure in place to support this ever growing community as it is.

The roads are gridlocked in the early morning as people try to make their way through, and out of the town, on their way to school and work.

The proposed number of new house are overstated.

G L Hearn's study 'South West Herts Local Housing Needs Assessment Final Report - September 2020 (PDF 2MB ', which covers Dacorum, indicates on page 5:

“Recommendation: There is no requirement for the Councils to increase the number of homes they plan for to support local economic growth.”

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9597
<b>Person ID</b>	1263214
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr R Pope
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I was forced to have a water meter installed last summer because I live in a high water shortage stress area. How do you believe that building an addition 2,236 new houses in Berkhamsted/Northchurch (without considering the proposed expansion of Tring) will alleviate an already known water sensitive area.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9598
<b>Person ID</b>	1267455
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms C Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I was forced to have a water meter installed last summer because I live in a high water shortage stress area. How do you believe that building an addition 2,236 new houses in Berkhamsted/Northchurch (without considering the proposed expansion of Tring) will alleviate an already known water sensitive area.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9609
<b>Person ID</b>	1267456
<b>Full Name</b>	David Sidebottom
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>RE: Emerging Strategy for Growth Proposals 2020-2038 and local plan in Northchurch</p> <p>I would like to lodge my objections to the proposed Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038. My objections are based on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing will be built on greenbelt land in Northchurch. The proposed developed areas are areas of natural beauty which myself, my family and my neighbours enjoy daily. The developments will have a major impact on the local landscape and also local biodiversity. It has not been established if the need to build on Greenbelt land is necessary, I understand that greenbelt land can only be released for development if entirely necessary. What other options are being explored?</li> <li>The development of this greenbelt land is at odds with the government's climate change initiatives. There is evidence in the plan relating to how recommendations contained In the Climate Change Committee Sixth carbon budget report Dec 2020 are being considered.</li> <li>The impact the developments will have on local infrastructure, adding to already significant traffic, strains on the healthcare system .</li> <li>It is accepted that the pandemic has led to a changing requirement for office space, and to a lesser extent, retail space. There is no consideration in the proposal to address this as a potential solution to addressing housing shortages. A holistic view must be taken on this particular when these plans began to be formulated prior to the global pandemic. So not only is DBC planning to release greenbelt land based on out of date statistics, it is failing to consider the ongoing changes in building uses and future requirements caused by the pandemic. In all lines of</li> </ul>

business the pandemic has forced process to be evaluated due to the impact of the pandemic, this should also apply to the council and flexible, lateral thinking is now required.

- The number of houses is entirely unnecessary. The number of houses required is not justified and is not based on recent data on the local need. The original proposal dates back to 2014!
- Northchurch will lose its identity. It has a thriving local community, but the plan refers to it as West Berkhamsted. Northchurch must be allowed to thrive independently of Berkhamsted.
- I am concerned about water management and flood risk. There appears to be little consideration in the plan to address scenarios relating to either of these.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9625

**Person ID** 1151590

**Full Name** Lynda Clarke

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities until after Plan seems to be illogical, or if there is good reason for this it should be used as a reason not to meet the Government target at this stage. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy in practice will be developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9639

**Person ID** 1151590

**Full Name** Lynda Clarke

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9687
<b>Person ID</b>	1267471
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>This email is in response to the consultation on the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth, please can you include it in the consultation responses.</b> <b>We are opposed to the proposals for Berkhamsted, for the reasons well articulated below by CPRE and with whose views we agree. While we understand the need for additional housing, the scale of the proposals for Berkhamsted would completely change the character of the town, and the reason why we and others have chosen to live here. We also strongly object to the loss of the green belt, and the environmental impacts set out below.</b>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9688
<b>Person ID</b>	1267472
<b>Full Name</b>	Debbie Hawkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This email is in response to the consultation on the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth, please can you include it in the consultation responses.</p> <p>We are opposed to the proposals for Berkhamsted, for the reasons well articulated below by CPRE and with whose views we agree. While we understand the need for additional housing, the scale of the proposals for Berkhamsted would completely change the character of the town, and the reason why we and others have chosen to live here. We also strongly object to the loss of the green belt, and the environmental impacts set out below.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9695
<b>Person ID</b>	1267474
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Porter-Hough
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It is with huge concern that I write as a resident of our lovely village community of Northchurch, to express my feelings on the proposal for housing to be built here, on our treasured Green Belt land within close proximity to our village centre. We have been fortunate enough to have lived here for the past 15 years, in a quiet road, side by side with neighbours, many of whom have resided here for 40 years or more.</p> <p>What makes Northchurch so special is that it isn't just an extension of Berkhamsted. It is a village in its own right, with a crossroads at the centre and the local St Mary's Primary School, St Mary's Church and the Baptist Church at the very heart of our community spirit.</p> <p>It sits here in our beautiful elongated valley running alongside the Grand Union Canal and the River Bulbourne, in a wildlife corridor. This in turn is bordered by the ancient woodland of the Ashridge Estate, belonging to the National Trust. Wildlife corridors run along the valley and waterways and criss cross from opposite sides of the valley. Muntjac deer are often seen wandering off the fields running either side of Darrs Lane, fields that are part of just one area that has been proposed for housing development.</p> <p><b>Traffic Congestion</b></p> <p>The development above, proposed on the SW side of the valley, is bordering a very narrow single width steep lane that drops down into the ever growing busyness of a road junction and the limited parking area outside Tesco Northchurch, which sits back from the High Street. Congestion in this small restricted area has increased when 'One Stop' became Tesco and attracts people not only walking from the immediate area of Northchurch but also from surrounding housing estates of the Bridgewater housing Estate which is on the opposite side of the valley. It is always a busy hub as it allows people to buy essential food items in the immediate vicinity without having to try and park in the picturesque, highly popular town of Berkhamsted, which has seen an increase in traffic and parking in recent years.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9697
<b>Person ID</b>	1267474
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Porter-Hough
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	These two housing development sites will cause a significant increase in traffic to the village, disproportionate to the size of our village infrastructure and creating danger along many of the small, often one track country lanes leading down into the centre. The High Street itself already experiences through traffic from Tring to Berkhamsted and it is this main road along with 'New Road' that many school children have to cross when attending the Primary School. With proposed increase in housing in Tring too our narrow High Street is going to become a more popular route for traffic accessing Berkhamsted and the Ashridge Estate.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9724
<b>Person ID</b>	1267480
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Townsend
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9731
<b>Person ID</b>	1145832
<b>Full Name</b>	Clive and Judy Birch
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We would urge you to consider all issues raised by Berkhamsted Town Council and by the many residents, like ourselves, who have lived in the town for many years and fear the negative impact which thoughtless peripheral residential development would have.</p> <p>Having compiled our list of issues of greatest concern, we read Berkhamsted Town Council's response, and found that it agrees with and covers our own views, and the arguments are very well expressed. We would therefore like to endorse all the points made in this response.</p> <p>The most important point which has been overlooked in the formulation of the Local Plan is the geographic location of Berkhamsted in a valley, which limits expansion of the town.</p> <p>Add to this the fact that much of the central part of the town was constructed during the Victorian era, thus the roads do not have the capacity to be widened, and there is no possibility of adding to the single, narrow east-west route across the town. This route is already subject to traffic congestion and poor air quality, and has no capacity for additional traffic volume, or for the addition of safe cycle routes.</p> <p>The sites proposed for housing development on the periphery of the town are unsuitable for the following reasons: their distance from central Berkhamsted and the topography of the area mean that: a) residents would be unlikely to walk or cycle to the town centre or the station, especially since it would be impossible to provide safe cycling routes through existing parts of the town, and in any case the gradients involved would be challenging for many users; b) the existing services infrastructure of the town, which already struggles to cope with demand, could not cope with the extra load which would accompany further development.</p> <p>Berkhamsted Town Council's response includes specific reasons for which certain of the proposed sites are unsuitable, with which we also agree.</p> <p>In particular we would additionally draw your attention to the following:</p>

- redevelopment of the Civic Centre, with the resulting loss of community facilities, alongside increased population, is totally unacceptable - does this assume there will be less demand?!
- ONS latest projections do not support the plan
- the current and resulting massive infrastructure deficits cannot be adequately funded from CIL and Section 106 contributions and it is unrealistic to think that timely support and funds will be available from either Local or National Government, bearing in mind the impact of the current pandemic and the financial impact this will continue to have especially on the required updating of hospitals following the lessons learnt from Covid 19.
- there is no traffic study/assessment that takes account of the impact of the proposal to build some 750 houses on the western boundary of Berkhamsted adjacent to Shooters Way and Darrs Lane, an area that is already choked with traffic at the junction of Kings Road plus the restricted road access on Darrs Lane.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9735

**Person ID** 1267484

**Full Name** Jonathan Wagstaff

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Housing numbers** - The plan represents a 24% increase in houses in Berkhamsted and 50% increase in Tring. I do not consider that the plan includes proposals for the significant additional infrastructure that would be required to support this, road improvements, traffic flow, water supply / drainage etc in what are already highly congested towns. Furthermore the council seems to have just accepted targets dictated by central government rather than challenging them based on the unique circumstances of the local area.

**Health and welfare considerations** - The plan does not make significant proposals to improve walking, cycling or public transport routes and nor does it provide improvements to public open spaces. The wildlife corridors proposed are narrow strips and no meaningful explanation is provided about how these will support habitats. I do not consider that the new Gossoms End surgery will be able to cope with the significant extra demand created and could not find data to support this.

The land proposed for use is greenbelt and my understanding is that whilst this is permitted, government policy is that this should only be in exceptional circumstances. I am not convinced that the proposals set out justify this in any way.

**Sustainability** - the plan predominantly proposes housing at the edge of town in hilly areas. It is inevitable that this will lead to reliance on travel in and out of already congested towns. This will lead to poorer air quality.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9740

**Person ID** 224020

**Full Name** Mrs Marlene Goffey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

*Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9741

**Person ID** 1267498

**Full Name** Judith and Brian Young

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We live in [address removed] Berkhamsted and are greatly concerned by proposals for nearly 2000 new dwellings in the town. This means a population increase of a minimum of ten to fifteen thousand people, with at least 3000 cars. The issues raised by this increase in population are manifold.</p> <p>The infrastructure of the town will be overwhelmed. The road structure will become clogged. Given the hilly nature of the town and the distance to the centre, people will be unable to walk or cycle as is promoted, but will use cars. This will rise emissions, and lead to major congestion.</p> <p>Health services are already stretched, as is education provision, and both of these will be adversely affected and possibly overwhelmed.</p> <p>Damage will be done to the local environment which is on the edge of the Chilterns and currently much of the area, especially south of the town, is green belt land which acts as a buffer between Berkhamsted and surrounding towns.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9743
<b>Person ID</b>	1267503
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa and Jeremy Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly OPPOSE to the proposal of the housing developments in Northchurch.</p> <p>Reasons why,</p> <p>We are a little village set on the edge of outstanding beauty. The new developments will destroy the feel of our village. The increased cars will pollute our high street even more than now, one of the worst polluted in Hertfordshire.</p>

The village is split by a very busy high street. It is almost impossible to cross and there is only one set of pedestrian crossing lights by the church. There has also been a fatality (9 year old girl!) And we are worried about possible future fatalities and accidents with the increase in cars and people.

The access to Ashridge is through our village and already as it is today very busy going up New Road over a one way old bridge. This road will be so congested and also compromises drop and pick up for the local primary school. As it is today cars are racing up and down, past the school and people trying to get to the allotments and canal. The peace and tranquillity of our much beloved allotment will be compromised by the new housing development by the Canal. This is bordering up against a green belt area where we have amazing wild life, king fishers, herons, deer and even otters have been spotted!

The council build and build houses, but there is a lack of infrastructure in place for all these new house and people moving to the area

Where are the children going to go to school, doctors surgery, path ways, pharmacies etc.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9745

**Person ID** 1267505

**Full Name** Greg Deacon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9746

<b>Person ID</b>	1267506
<b>Full Name</b>	Victoria Deacon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9747
<b>Person ID</b>	1267508
<b>Full Name</b>	Miya Deacon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9748
<b>Person ID</b>	1267510
<b>Full Name</b>	Max Deacon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9752
<b>Person ID</b>	1267512
<b>Full Name</b>	Barry Hills
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under Barry Hills



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9758
<b>Person ID</b>	1267514
<b>Full Name</b>	Michelle Day
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I object to the current plans to Northchurch. The current plan of 2220 + houses is too much that the infrastructure can hold. Please accept this email as a objection to the current plans.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9759
<b>Person ID</b>	1267515
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa Battye
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a Berkhamsted resident who has lived in the town for 42 years I am objecting to the proposed DBC local plan to build 2200 more houses in the town.

80% of which will be on greenbelt sites.

My main objections are the following;

- There is inadequate school provision/places particularly at senior school level which I know is already squeezed.
- Damage of the countryside around the present town by releasing green belt sites robbing the community of an important health resource and in addition to destroying important habitat unique to the Chiltern hills and chalk downland.
- Increase in traffic levels in this already congested valley town.

Moreover I do not object to housing being built in fact I did not object to the 628 new houses recently built on the outskirts of the town or the 600 already planned but what I do object to is the scale of these proposals, increasing the town by 25%. DBC are also ignoring the national planning policy contained in the NPPF and the statements made by the Prime Minister himself that Green Belt should not be released only in 'exceptional circumstances' and DBC have so far failed to actually outline what these actually are.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9760

**Person ID** 1267516

**Full Name** Lizzie Edwards

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to object to the proposed Local Plan to build 2236 houses in Berkhamsted.

I disagree with this plan because it will cause additional pollution and traffic congestion. It will also effect our beautiful local green belt area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9762

<b>Person ID</b>	1267518
<b>Full Name</b>	Dave and Anne Phillips
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are writing as Berkhamsted Residents in response to this subject.</p> <p>We object for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The waste of acres of currently producing farm land.(irreplaceable )</li> <li>2 To many houses for the local Medical,Education,Social &amp; Commuting facilities.</li> <li>3 We confirm that we agree with all points put forward by our Local Residents Action Group (BRAG)</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9763
<b>Person ID</b>	1267520
<b>Full Name</b>	Bryan Phillips
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to express my deep concerns over your current local plan for new housing in Berkhamsted. It is my opinion that under the current proposal, you would clearly not be delivering the local plan objectives that you outline as your intentions. My points are as follows;</p>

- The current plan appears to be filling in every part of green space around the town with little space or investment in suitable new recreational facilities. This is a real shame as all generations suffer with a lack of outdoor facilities and green spaces. As an example, the current Bearroc estate in development where the houses have filled every square foot available and a lack of consideration for outdoor space. ‘Supporting community health, wellbeing and cohesion’ does not appear to be a consideration in your plans.
- The strategy of micro estates popping up and filling in all the fields around the town brings a real danger of wrapping this beautiful historic town with a housing estate. This seems at odds with your objective of ‘Ensuring an attractive and valued built and historic environment’?
- In addition to the lack of recreational facilities, there is also a real challenge in this area for both traffic and secondary school capacity, neither of which seem to have been addressed in your proposals. In particular, the amount of housing earmarked for the Shootersway part of town seems intensive when you consider that this is already a problem road in the area. When not caught up in queues during rush hour, cars travel very fast along here without adequate footpath width or protection. Your current proposal will significantly intensify this issue making it a very dangerous road that will not be able to safely support the volume of traffic that you are intending to add to it. There is already a significant issue with Charles Street which is not suitable for traffic diversions due to the single lane nature of the road, and every time a diversion is routed that way it ends in gridlock. Your other value of ‘promoting and facilitating sustainable transport and connectivity’ is not being addressed with this plan.

I do not support these proposals as currently outlined in your strategy and I hope that there is enough local support to ensure that they are addressed before you proceed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9764

**Person ID** 1267521

**Full Name** Hilary Mayman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

*Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9765

**Person ID** 1146003

**Full Name** Mrs Lesley Johnson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

*This is a resubmission including full address with postcode.*

*Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9766

**Person ID** 1267522

**Full Name** James Savage

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>I do not support this plan and any proposals for the use of Green belt and useful agricultural land for such widespread development.</i></p> <p><i>The number of homes planned is not adequately justified in the plan.</i></p> <p><i>The existing infrastructure in Berkhamsted is inadequate to support such extensive expansion of the town of Berkhamsted.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation.</i></p> <p><i><a href="http://www.nosouthberkhamstedconcept.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/BRAG-2021-submission-to-DBC-Local-Plan-Consultation-FINAL.pdf">http://www.nosouthberkhamstedconcept.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/BRAG-2021-submission-to-DBC-Local-Plan-Consultation-FINAL.pdf</a></i></p> <p><i>To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I also wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9767
<b>Person ID</b>	1267523
<b>Full Name</b>	Patsy Savage
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p>

*I do not support this plan and any proposals for the use of Green belt and useful agricultural land for such widespread development.*

*The number of homes planned is not adequately justified in the plan.*

*The existing infrastructure in Berkhamsted is inadequate to support such extensive expansion of the town of Berkhamsted.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation.*

*<http://www.nosouthberkhamstedconcept.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/BRAG-2021-submission-to-DBC-Local-Plan-Consultation-FINAL.pdf>*

*To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I also wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9777

**Person ID** 1267528

**Full Name** Clare Williams

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Firstly, I would like to record my opposition to the proposed development at Bulbourne Cross. I am very concerned about the level of marketing they have been able to use and wonder how this is allowed as separate to the overall plan, if Dacorum borough council are not allowed to market in the same way then surely this is unfair competition.

I also want to record my opposition to the scale of the proposed Local plan at Berkhamsted due to the fact that it includes building on green belt land and does not adequately address the issue of increased traffic and pollution in such a small town.

I would also like to request that more council housing is built and smaller more affordable housing rather than all the huge very expensive housing that seems to be evident in the current housing development off shooters way.

I am pleased to see proposals for new schools but we need more on accessibility into the town for all (bus routes and safe cycle paths).

I would also like to comment that the website for making comments online to the proposal was very difficult to navigate, I tried several times but had to come back to email.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9780

**Person ID** 1267529

**Full Name** Lydia and Don Carmichael

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- We understand Dacorum proposes over 16000 new homes with circa 600 for Northchurch. This will mean we will no longer be a village and become submerged into We have chosen to retire to a village and find it distressing the state of our community will be altered - indeed we have already been referred to as "West Berkhamsted", wholly incorrect. Northchurch is a village, in its own right.
- We sit between Berkhamsted and Tring and with all the proposed growth Northchurch will become gridlocked and overly congested rendering it inaccessible and dangerous for children and pedestrians.
- We have a wealth of wildlife along our hedgerows, footpaths, rolling fields, woodlands and canal. We enjoy our beautiful surroundings and already our infrastructure is

We urge you to re-look at the statistics supporting this growth proposal, place higher regard and value on the fact Dacorum is in the greenbelt and resubmit a more accurate consultation when we are fully out of a pandemic.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9788

**Person ID** 1267532

**Full Name** Sian Samual



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9792
<b>Person ID</b>	1267544
<b>Full Name</b>	CATHERINE HAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p> <p>— <b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small</p>

community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9798

**Person ID** 1267546

**Full Name** WIGGS PAUL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9799

**Person ID** 1267547

**Full Name** SHEENA COSTER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

In summary, the extensive development plans are not suitable to the town and will destroy green belt land.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9800

**Person ID** 1267549

**Full Name** DANIEL COSTER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>In summary, the extensive development plans are not suitable to the town and will destroy green belt land.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9801
<b>Person ID</b>	1267550
<b>Full Name</b>	TAMSIN WHEATLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9814
<b>Person ID</b>	1265575
<b>Full Name</b>	STUART MCKAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to endorse everything that has been forwarded to you by BRAG and the ONE VOICE ALLIANCE in respect of opposition to the Dacorum Local Plan.</p> <p>Had we not received regular updates from BRAG, and some fancy advertising from a developer, we would not be aware of the situation as THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NOTHING THROUGH OUR LETTERBOX.</p> <p>Please do not forget you are elected to serve the community and should take note of the views of those who PAY THE TAXES.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9815
<b>Person ID</b>	1265577
<b>Full Name</b>	MIRANDA MCKAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to endorse everything that has been forwarded to you by BRAG and the ONE VOICE ALLIANCE in respect of opposition to the Dacorum Local Plan.</p> <p>Had we not received regular updates from BRAG, and some fancy advertising from a developer, we would not be aware of the situation as THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NOTHING THROUGH OUR LETTERBOX.</p> <p>Please do not forget you are elected to serve the community and should take note of the views of those who PAY THE TAXES.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9816
<b>Person ID</b>	1265583
<b>Full Name</b>	MELISSA MCKAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to endorse everything that has been forwarded to you by BRAG and the ONE VOICE ALLIANCE in respect of opposition to the Dacorum Local Plan.</p> <p>Had we not received regular updates from BRAG, and some fancy advertising from a developer, we would not be aware of the situation as THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NOTHING THROUGH OUR LETTERBOX.</p> <p>Please do not forget you are elected to serve the community and should take note of the views of those who PAY THE TAXES.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9819
<b>Person ID</b>	1144203
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Tony Hutchings
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>briefly, I am write to object to what I have seen of the proposed Dacorum Local Plan.</p> <p>Speaking about Berkhamsted, which has been my home for over twenty five years I am opposed to plans to build on the Green Belt, which I understand a large part of your plans include.</p> <p>Even now there are already many houses being built in Berkhamsted with insufficient increase in amenities.</p> <p>Please rethink,</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9820
<b>Person ID</b>	1267666
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Caroline Donovan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my extreme concerns re the current proposals for 1000's of additional Houses to be built on Greenbelt land in Dacorum</p> <p>I agree in full with all the evidence and points made by the Berkhamsted Citizens Group- See attached document below</p> <p>I Sincerely hope that these concerns are considered in all their seriousness and the proposals for thousands of new homes are re considered as a matter of urgency by Dacorum Borough Council</p> <p>Residents deserve a measured and reasonable alternative proposal to take all these points into account and with likely changes to lifestyle post Covid-19 being still unknown, as a further consideration in the future</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9821
<b>Person ID</b>	1267671
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sylvia Morris
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am concerned about the sheer number of houses that are planned for Berkhamsted – mainly built on green field sites.</p> <p>I agree that we need to ensure there are enough homes in England but increasing the town size by 24 per cent with a further 17,000 homes seems excessive.</p>



The algorithm used to show that we need to build 922 houses a year is almost three times the 355 a year ONS projection of the growth needed. Does this 922 figure need amending?

I am also concerned about the water and sewage problems that could arise from such a vast development as well as medical facilities.

Traffic is a further issue. Berkhamsted is built in a relatively steep valley with the majority of the vast proposed development at the top of the hill, far from the town centre and station.

This will cause transport problems in a town which already sees the centre gridlocked during the rush hour and at the beginning and end of the school day.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9833

**Person ID** 1267718

**Full Name** LAURA ANTONIA RACTLIFFE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I moved to Berkhamsted approximately 3 years ago. I love living here and think it is an amazing place for my daughter to grow up. Naturally I have taken a great interest in the proposed new developments. A proposed 25% increase in housing for a small market town such as Berkhamsted is worrying. I would therefore like to object to the proposed Dacorum Local Plan for the following reasons:

- 1 A detailed plan on the required investment and improvement on infrastructure has yet to be published, it is therefore not possible to assess the possible long term remedies the council has considered. If a 25% increase in houses is proposed more in depth review and proposal of infrastructure improvements needs to take place.

I would love to work closer to home, however this is not currently possible as there are very few larger companies in Dacorum. I therefore commute into London. The trains are a nightmare: old, delayed and packed to the brim. If additional houses were built; due to the lack of larger companies in the area and as the Employment Strategy does not cover any additional employment options in Berkhamsted, it is likely that the majority of those new inhabitants will be commuting. The current service isn't able to service the existing population and local politicians are not able to make any improvements to the provisions of this key service, how can it possibly support any additional population (both in Berkhamsted and Tring)?

1 The new housing is proposed to be built on greenbelt land. Protecting our environment is becoming more and more important and it is not clear how using greenbelt land can be aligned with the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Objectives for example "To protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity at all levels". The Covid pandemic has also shown how important green spaces for people's wellbeing and health. Destroying this space does not make sense.

1 The calculation of housing needs seems to have been vastly overestimated due to using outdated targets. These calculations should be updated and the proposed plan reviewed based on these.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9835

**Person ID** 1265032

**Full Name** Thomas Ractliffe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

## **Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident of Berkhamsted I wish to state my objection to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020 - 2038) for the proposed growth sites which cover Berkhamsted (BK0, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11 & 12).

Before I state the reasons for my objections, I have to say that the communication for this consultation has been very poor. If it wasn't for our local Liberal Democrat councillor and a flyer received through my front door about the Bullbourne Cross proposal (which I object to) I would not have known at all. I actually wonder how many other residents are not aware because of the lack of communication. For something this vital to our local area, is there a reason why there was not more communication such as leaflet drops through all letter boxes, a window display in one of the vacant shops in the High Street?

The reasons for my objections are; Green Belt development, inadequate infrastructure to cope with so many new houses, lack of services, employment opportunities and environmental impact in the town.

**Green Belt Development;** During the pandemic, having green belt land we could walk around and exercise in safety was a godsend. Berkhamsted is lucky to be surrounded by lots of open space, parks and footpaths the local community can enjoy. This is shared by the Prime Minister who has said in the past that Green Belt should only be developed on in exceptional circumstances. This proposal makes no such reference to what the exceptional circumstances are. Mr Mohindra, could you tell me what the exceptional circumstances are as this proposal is going against comments made by your party leader, The Prime Minister? Growth site BK-01 is on farm land, therefore how can taking this away promote British Farming? We should be doing everything we can to protect local British Industry. The views around Berkhamsted are some of the nicest views around the Chilterns and again this must be protected and not built upon.

**Inadequate Infrastructure and Environmental Impact:** Berkhamsted suffers from a lack of infrastructure. The main road through the town centre is often congested and adding more houses and cars is not viable. The proposed BK-01 growth site is close to 2 primary schools with only a single road (Swing Gate Lane) serving that area. Increasing traffic and pollution near children is unthinkable. As a new father who will more than likely be sending my daughter to either Thomas Choram or Swing Gate Lane schools, increased pollution so close to childrens playing ground scares me. I live approximately 1 mile from the town centre and train station, however the larger growth sites BK-01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06 and 07 are all further away from the town centre. Therefore if residents want to travel to the town centre or train station a car is the most likely form of transport. This will only add to an already congested town centre. How can this have a positive effect on the environment?

**Employment Opportunities:** With all the extra housing proposed for Berkhamsted, will the same be said for employment opportunities? I would love to have a job locally which means I do not need to commute into Central London. I know we're in a pandemic and the vast majority of the population is working from home but with the continued success of the

Covid-19 vaccine rollout, there is light at the end of the tunnel where returning back to the office is more than likely. Berkhamsted is a commuter town and the increased housing will only increase the number of people commuting on an already unreliable and over capacity train service. I can not see anything in the plan which is promoting or bringing large business or skilled jobs to Berkhamsted which would suit the demographic of the Berkhamsted population.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9837

**Person ID** 1267722

**Full Name** ANNA AUSTEN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

My husband and I have reviewed with great concern the plans for the expansion of Berkhamsted in the Dacorum Council planning consultation.

Berkhamsted is an attractive small town, located in the Chilterns hills. It is well positioned along the canal/railway line and set within the confines of the Bulbourne Valley. It is surrounded by green fields on either side and the geomorphology of the landscape and the local transport infrastructure provide natural boundaries to the development of the town.

The expansion of Berkhamsted proposed by Dacorum Council is completely excessive, bearing in mind the transport infrastructure, services and existing population density of the area. The High Street is regularly completely log jammed and pollution levels unacceptably, even dangerously, high. The local health services and schools are completely oversubscribed. The focus of the Council and the community should be sustainable development on appropriate brownfield sites and the preservation of the existing green belt, neither of which are respected by the proposed development. Are we truly to believe that more appropriate sites for development cannot be found within Dacorum borough? It stretches credulity.

We wish to express our great concern that developments of the size and nature proposed in this plan suit nobody but the volume housebuilders, who pursue such sites with a view to maximum profit generation, with little thought to the existing community and environmental concerns. This must not be allowed to happen and we urge the Council not to permit it and to reconsider their proposed approach.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9838

**Person ID** 1267723

**Full Name** JOEL JAMES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident, I implore DBC to reconsider this plan which proposes massive over-development on an already stressed environment, with severe implications for the integrity of the Green Belt and our status as an AONB (in fact, the 2019 Glover Report recommended that the Chilterns should be given National Park Status). Our countryside is precious and finite and therefore critical that land is not lost to unnecessary development.

The following are my principal objections:

- 1 The figures for the amount of housing throughout the whole of Dacorum, appear incorrect. The Council is using outdated (2014) housing projections. The overall number of houses proposed throughout the Borough - 16899, is just not justified by the latest statistics on projected growth. There is also the question that these houses will be executive in nature and there will be limited social housing.
- 2 Loss of Green Belt land and the impact this will have on mental and physical wellbeing. The ability to walk from your house, without using a car to a green space, is vital for wellbeing as well as the environment. This was illustrated during this past year during lockdown. Personally, as a Northchurch resident the countryside by the A41 and the fields by Bell and Darrs Lane, prove to be so important during this time. Not forgetting, these areas have an abundant array of wildlife and I believe, ancient woodlands. It would be a travesty to build over this. I would like to remind DBC that the Law states we can only build on Green Belt land if proven necessary - this does not

appear to the case in this proposal. I also remember when the A41 was proposed, these green corridors would be left, undisturbed, as a "green lung" absorbing emission from the A41. The proposed number of houses could be built on Brownfield land in the existing urban areas of Hemel Hempstead, Tring, Berkhamsted and Kings Langley and not on Green Belt land and the Chilterns AONB.

- 3 Loss of Northchurch's Identity. Northchurch has not even been referred to in the proposal, but appears to be renamed as "West Berkhamsted". Northchurch is very much its own community and village, separate from Berkhamsted. With two churches, a pub, shops and a thriving cricket club, I am proud of its history, but this proposal appears to rename it as well as threaten to lose its charm and community feeling with an over provision of housing.
- 4 The sheer volume of housing will have a knock-on effect to every town. The massive development in Tring and Berkhamsted as well as the proposed housing in Northchurch, will create a gridlock in the narrow Northchurch High street. There are no plans for playing areas or football pitches. Where will the children go to play? There are no plans for additional health services, our Doctors Surgeries are already over stretched.
- 5 Poor Air quality has been noted in Northchurch and Berkhamsted. Most residents live along the valley and towards the bottom and up the sides and air pollution naturally collects in this area. Development proposed on this scale will only result in further air pollution, affecting those with asthma and respiratory conditions the worse.
- 6 Water, Sewage and Waste Disposal. As a resident who lives in the valley, our road is prone to flooding. The drainage system already appears strained and I worry the volume of houses will only add to the fragile system in place already.

I am not against housing and especially building affordable homes. It is, however, the sheer volume of housing and loss of countryside and community with a lack of planning, that I object to in this proposal. We are custodians of our environment and countryside for future generations. It would be catastrophic to lose all this precious countryside on our watch, as it can never be replaced. Therefore, I can only come to the conclusion that the plan is aggressive and intrusive. The unique and welcoming community of Northchurch would blend into Berkhamsted. It would be shameful to further injure ancient woodland and destroy the special and distinct character of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9841
<b>Person ID</b>	1267729
<b>Full Name</b>	DIANA WHITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I want to object to the proposed new homes in our local area (Dacorum) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property numbers really concerns me the most. The 16,899 homes is a disproportionate increase considering the Governments projected population growth statistics. This is an unreasonable and unnecessary burden to undertake for our locality.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposed housing in our neighbouring towns of Tring and Berkhamsted, in addition to the 400 houses in Northchurch, will cause traffic congestion especially on our High Street. That's not discounting the obvious increased pollution and hazard this poses our children especially with our school placed right bang centre of the village with poor side-walks and access.</li> <li>• Northchurch is a village and is therefore very connected to its beautiful local countryside. Building on Green belt here and in Dacorum is unlawful as it has not been proven to be necessary. Within minutes of my home I can walk into lovely countryside and enjoy the peace and fresh air it provides, as well as the nature that inhabits it. You can not undervalue its importance for our physical and mental well being which has been highlighted in this Pandemic</li> <li>• I really worries me that we would lose our community and village identity as we meld into Berkhamsted. We see ourselves apart from Berkhamsted and wish to keep it this way. I've read mention of our village as 'West Berkhamsted' and this upsets me as we have lovely tree lined roads a plenty, drives for our cars to park on and our own real sense of identity quite different to Berkhamsted. We have our own school and churches and mini Tesco.</li> <li>• Darrs Lane is already too narrow for 2-way traffic and Granville Road is often the same with all the cars parked each side. So if I want to reach Shootersway and the A41 I have to drive down to the main road and along to Durrants Lane. This will become infinitely busier under your new plan</li> <li>• Crossing New Road as a pedestrian is already difficult and sometimes dangerous because of insufficient pavements and because cars are held up at the bridge and then speed afterwards. That becomes a huge hazard with school children crossing. Adding more houses, cars, people next to New Road is a dangerous and ill-conceived proposal</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9846
<b>Person ID</b>	1264090
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Fyvie-Rae
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I have been reading about the proposals laid out within the draft local plan and having been a local of this area for my whole life and having just moved to the centre of Berkhamsted I must say that I strongly object to the plans and believe them to be grossly out of scale with the infrastructure and local amenities (schools, roads, shops, leisure facilities) provided in Berkhamsted. The greenbelt should be protected and should not be obliterated with huge developments like those that have been proposed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9848
<b>Person ID</b>	1267739
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW AND JOANNE DAFFERN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9849
<b>Person ID</b>	1267741
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON RANGER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to say as a berkhamsted resident who has lived in upper hall park for 58 years and has views over the green belt land that you propose to build on .</p> <p>NO this should not happen berkhamsted is stretch to its limits, schools , roads ect would suffer, This is green belt land and should not be built on as we end up with an over populated town .</p> <p>I have concerns on how swing gate can cope with more traffic as it's busy enough with school runs from Thomas coram and swing gate as a resident along upper hall park .</p> <p>The wild life would suffer not to mention the green land that would become concrete so yet again wild animals suffer .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9853
<b>Person ID</b>	1267744
<b>Full Name</b>	GARETH BELLAMY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</li> <li>• I believe this plan sets a dangerous precedent in terms of use of land in the Green Belt. To have such a resource on the edge of the town is one of the things that gives the area its character. To destroy this will massively devalue the area and set the tone for further developments to continue.</li> </ul>

- Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.
- The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.
- There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).
- Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.
- There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.
- This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9861

**Person ID** 1267453

**Full Name** Simon Light

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9862
<b>Person ID</b>	1267748
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE ROBINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9863
<b>Person ID</b>	1267749
<b>Full Name</b>	DANIELE ROBINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9864
<b>Person ID</b>	1267750
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIQUE ROBINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9866

<b>Person ID</b>	1267751
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRISTIAN HANSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>Please note every single resident of Berkhamsted and surrounding areas I have spoken with is outraged at these proposals. It is imperative that a proper consultation of the people who are affected – i.e. the residents – is undertaken before any next steps are agreed.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9867
<b>Person ID</b>	1267754
<b>Full Name</b>	DIANE HOLLIDAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>A lot of work has gone into your planning for the future.  Unfortunately I do not accept that the plans suggested are practical.  Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring are very pleasant towns/villages but they are already reaching a point of being overcrowded. They are small market towns. There has already been much building .  The main road goes through the centre of each of them, causing obstruction, pollution, danger and noise. To add a further mass of houses would cause further problems. I do not see how there is room to change the size and safety of the roads.  Following the building of the bypass I cannot see how even more cars could be accommodated. Not to mention the parking.  There is also the problem of the difficulty in managing the increasing services necessary to a larger community. These services are stretched already.  I am very disturbed at the idea of building on the valuable and treasured Green Belt.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9871
<b>Person ID</b>	1264942
<b>Full Name</b>	Douglas Carr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I oppose this plan in several areas</p> <p>1) in this time of a pandemic trying to push legislation through that does not allow for actual representation is undemocratic. Why this has to be done now I really cannot understand. Without actual physical representation I believe that the council will just rubber stamp this and like the car park addition to Berkhamsted we will see a degradation of the physical space</p>

at the behest of commercial requirements. I believe this plan should be delayed until representaiton can be delivered in terms of physical meetings.

2) Having read the plan I can see no actual "real" evidence for this amount of new homes. The government plan and its nominal numbers have been shown to be wildly exaggerated on many occasions. Where is the evidence? Statements of future growth etc remain to be seen and to date the last ten years have shown that all government estimations have been off the mark.

3) The noise pollution from the A41 in Berkhamsted and Northchurch is already impacting peoples lifes. Extra cars etc will both add to this polution along with a more busy high street. Both negative qualities in this so called green age.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9880

**Person ID** 1267758

**Full Name** GISELLE WHITTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9888
<b>Person ID</b>	1267760
<b>Full Name</b>	MATTHEW WHITTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9892
<b>Person ID</b>	1267761
<b>Full Name</b>	JACKIE WAI
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wish to object to more development being agreed in the local plan on the grounds of Green Belt, lack of children facilities including schools and building further into the Eco environment of Berkhamsted/Northchurch
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9893
<b>Person ID</b>	1267762
<b>Full Name</b>	NICHOLA DWIGHT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>With reference to the planned development in Berkhamsted I wish to raise my objection to this for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 i) I do not believe that there are adequate facilities in Berkhamsted eg schools, doctors, dentists and general healthcare i.e. access to hospitals</li> <li>2 ii) I believe that due to the planned locations this will lead to more use of vehicles into the town leading having an impact on the environment</li> <li>iii) I do not believe that all brownfield sites have been thoroughly explored</li> <li>1 iv) The effects of COVID may have a major impact on how business is conducted therefore more properties may become available for residential use.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9895
<b>Person ID</b>	1267763
<b>Full Name</b>	James Spencer

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9897
<b>Person ID</b>	1264314
<b>Full Name</b>	Carol Preedy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9898
<b>Person ID</b>	1267766
<b>Full Name</b>	KEITH PREEDY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9899
<b>Person ID</b>	1267765
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Spencer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9900
<b>Person ID</b>	1267767
<b>Full Name</b>	LAUREN CLARKE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p> <p>We immediately need to have thought on the environment. The flooding we get from excessive rainfall is already high and to think of how bad it will be once these houses are built is unimaginable!</p> <p>Climate change and damage on the environment and we're proposing to build more houses?!?!?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9901
<b>Person ID</b>	1267768
<b>Full Name</b>	LISA MACHELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name:</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9905
<b>Person ID</b>	1267771
<b>Full Name</b>	LORRAINE DUNNE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.

Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a strain on the current and future infrastructure on the community.

It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.

This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9911

**Person ID** 1267773

**Full Name** Will Ryan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident of Berkhamsted (address removed) I am greatly concerned by proposals for nearly 2000 new homes. I realise there is a pressing need for new homes, but I believe the proportional increase in comparison to the town size is to high.

I strongly believe that not only will the character and community of the town be greatly impacted, but the infrastructure will be overwhelmed.

Health services and education provisions are already stretched in the local area. An increase in population will adversely affected and possibly overwhelmed them.

The developments will also eat in to vital green belt land.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9913
<b>Person ID</b>	741664
<b>Full Name</b>	dr joyce taylor-papadimitriou
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this email as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9917
<b>Person ID</b>	1267775
<b>Full Name</b>	LUCINDA STEEL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9923

**Person ID** 1267776

**Full Name** Will Garbutt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident of Northchurch Common, I am writing to register my concern and express my astonishment and disgust at plans for the proposed massive housing expansion projects and developments in the Tring, Berkhamsted & Northchurch area. My reasons are:-

1. The overall amount of houses across the borough is disproportionate to current population growth figures.
  - 1 No thought to the impact on the impact on congestion of roads which are small and largely already in a very bad state.
  - 2 This is greenbelt land and needs to be conserved for delicate ecosystems of wild animals, insects, plants and trees.
  - 3 No clarity on whether these 17,000 extra house in the proposal will be affordable
  5. The impact on overcrowding of school places dwindling for current residents, many of which moved to the area at great expense to get a better education for their children.
- 4 The impact on climate change will be huge at a time when we need to taking great care to scale back on damage to the environment.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9928



<b>Person ID</b>	1267777
<b>Full Name</b>	JOSEPH RANDALL-DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9934
<b>Person ID</b>	1267774
<b>Full Name</b>	AATMA SEESURRUN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical.

The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9936

**Person ID** 1267774

**Full Name** AATMA SEESURRUN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9939

**Person ID** 1267782

**Full Name** WENDY BANFIELD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Re Berkhamsted, in particular, I object to some aspects of the proposals on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No substantive nor effective consideration has been given to the road transport access routes from either the “South Berkhamsted” or various “off Shootersway and Northchurch area” sites to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. The A41</li> <li>Or</li> <li>1.2. The town centre or rail station. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.1. new Roundabout fed access roads into the A41 need to be constructed PRIOR to the development of either of housing on sites in either of these locations.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>One, towards the Rossway end of Shootersway, that could take traffic from the West of Berko &amp; one to the east that could service the proposed new South Berko development; both giving direct new A41 access. This infrastructure cannot be installed, after building, relying on CIL levies. It must be in place BEFORE building starts on fear sites.</p> <p>These 2 new access roads would take some pressure off the already, “frequently jammed at peak hours” roads of Shootersway &amp; Kings Road, giving some access to the town centre.</p> <p>The various “off Shootersway &amp; Northchurch“ sites should not be allowed to be developed if such access is not already in place.</p> </li> <li>2. Haslam Fields is one of the few “level ground” sites in Berko. It must be retained as playing fields, even if Berko School were minded to develop it. Instead it should be acquired by DBC/ HCC as a community playing field amenity/ well-being infrastructure area.</li> <li>3. No consideration seems to have been given to the fact that Berko is essentially a dormitory town, with few local employment opportunities. The terrain mitigates against substantial future employment site opportunities. Therefore, who will the new development serve? If local residents, note that the demographic in Berko is heavily weighted towards older folk. Many of them would wish to downsize locally, but not to “leasehold” “rabbit hutches” with minuscule internal dimensions. So called “retirement apartments in Berko are currently hard to shift on the resale market because they do not meet the needs of downsizers. They may meet the needs of DBC to tick their “development boxes” or the needs of the developers to maximise their profits, but surely the DBC should be acting in the interests of residents, not developers.</li> <li>4. No mention is made of build quality of minimum size requirements. The DBC must insist on these, with high attached standards being specified in the local plan.</li> <li>5. Densities must be controlled in Berko. What might be acceptable for HH: minuscule cramped 2 bed dwellings is not going to appeal to potential Berko downsizers, who one needs to get moving to free up larger houses for new young families.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9940
<b>Person ID</b>	1267783
<b>Full Name</b>	Jean Margaret Rose Forbes-Harriss
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2023) Emergency Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request that you accept this as our confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate Brag's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9941
<b>Person ID</b>	1267784
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE GREEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to say that I strongly disagree with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed.

The road system in particular and the infrastructure in general already struggle to cope with the current population - and that is before the completion of the next phase of Bearoc Park. The revised junction at the top of Kings Road is flawed; it is not wide enough to allow traffic to filter on to Kingshill Way when traffic is waiting to turn on to Shooters Way. There are already significant traffic queues at peak times.

I urge you to reconsider the plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9942

**Person ID** 1267785

**Full Name** Peter John Forbes-Harriss

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2023) Emergency Strategy for Growth Consultation.  
The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request that you accept this as our confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate Brag's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9944

**Person ID** 1267786

**Full Name** BRYONY GLENN

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In Berkhamsted the infrastructure is completely insufficient to accommodate the huge amount of proposed additional housing - a gridlocked town centre constrained by the valley location simply cannot accommodate additional cars and yet virtually none of the proposed housing is within walking or cycling distance of the town centre - the environmental impacts will be terrible. And with no additional access points onto the A41 proposed the area proposed to be developed will lead to huge additional congestion on unsuitable roads.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9961
<b>Person ID</b>	1267789
<b>Full Name</b>	RICHARD WILNE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to object to the proposed Dacorum local plan.</p> <p>The number of houses proposed for Dacorum will alter the character of the area from rural with defined villages and market towns to a suburban sprawl. No explanation has been put forward justifying this detrimental change.</p> <p>I am in particular shocked at the proposed massive expansion of Tring. We are all accustomed to new building and resigned to new housing estates built in the new placeless vernacular of the large developers, but the scale of the proposed changes is unacceptable.</p>

The great achievement of post war planning is to prevent urban sprawl, using the Green Belt to keep towns distinct and separate. The proposed developments between Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead suggest that councillors and officials have failed to comprehend the legacy handed down to them and have no intention of living up to it.

I understand the grounds by which Green Belt land may be released for development and do not consider these to have been met. I do not have confidence in the council's forecasts of housing need or the analysis on which these are based; nor do I have confidence that these are robust as a forward-looking exercise given the as yet unknown effects of the pandemic on patterns of work and family formation, on the apparent migration from London and the resulting changes to the capital, on the future requirements for currently commercial premises in our towns, and on the effects of population size in the wake of Covid and Brexit, with the Economic Statistics Centre of Excellence having recently estimated that 1.3 million foreign-born residents have left the UK.

Given this uncertainty, it seems shortsighted to 'lock in' the destruction through irreversible change of a much cherished area by reliance on estimates that simply cannot bear the weight being placed on them.

I am acutely conscious of the environmental impacts inherent in the proposed plans. In particular, the effect on the chalk streams within the area will be profound. The dry upper reaches of the river Ver upstream from St Albans should be a minatory lesson for all involved in this decision and I urge all officials and councillors involved to walk this route and subsequently justify to themselves and residents why this should be inflicted on the rivers Gade and Bulbourne.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9968

**Person ID** 1267792

**Full Name** Philip Jones

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We would like to object to the scale of building 2,200 new homes based on questionable population statistics. The impact of overdevelopment in the past planning period means the current population of Berkhamsted is causing its water, sewerage, energy, roads, medical and educational facilities to operate beyond capacity as evidenced by ever increasing road closures, children commuting to Hemel and Bucks, and GP wait lists. The Draft Plan admits there is zero committed financial support for maintaining, never mind improving, this existing old and decaying infrastructure in Berkhamsted and as a result will be unable to safely accommodate a further 20% growth in the Local Plan time period. There is significant uncertainty about retail and leisure along the High Street as a result of the shift to more online activities which adds to the stresses elsewhere and appears to have been ignored. Releasing any further green belt land for housing development under these conditions only brings this process into disrepute. Some key pieces of information missing from the local plan is the quantity of land and the names of the large builders who have been awarded greenbelt land in the past 10 years, the time taken for it to be developed, how many homes they built and how much was affordable housing in order to realistically to see whether the Plan is even realistic.</p> <p>We support the deletion of the Ivy House Lane site. However, the development on the south side of Berkhamsted is excessive for the reasons stated above and release of greenbelt land, regardless of whether it will ever be built on, is insatiable and not driven by DBC policy but by builder's profit.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9969
<b>Person ID</b>	1267792
<b>Full Name</b>	Philip Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Planning additional homes, which may be constructed to sustainable or environmentally sound principles, are not sustainable nor environmentally friendly when nearby surrounding areas and facilities (Areas of Outstanding Beauty and Berkhamsted town) are ruined for all whilst trying to accommodate something they were never intended to be used for. Accessing facilities miles away on roads that are not conducive to walking or cycling because of the extremely hilly terrain is factual and means more traffic damage is inevitable.</p>



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9970
<b>Person ID</b>	1267792
<b>Full Name</b>	Philip Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This is evidenced by the recent proposal of the Thakeham developers which promotes its housing development requiring release of significantly more greenbelt land between Broadway Farm and Hall Park beyond the 2,200 homes in the Draft Plan. This development would merge the town with Bourne End which is already connected to Hemel and directly opposes established Green Belt policy. Additionally it would create more landscape vandalism approaching the town which would be highly visible, visually unattractive from surrounding areas and spoil views of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed relocation of central sports facilities more remotely from Berkhamsted towards Hemel will involve more traffic across the town and is less sustainable and environmentally unfriendly. This scheme would create more congestion within Berkhamsted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9971
<b>Person ID</b>	1267794
<b>Full Name</b>	Kathleen Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We would like to object to the scale of building 2,200 new homes based on questionable population statistics. The impact of overdevelopment in the past planning period means the current population of Berkhamsted is causing its water, sewerage, energy, roads, medical and educational facilities to operate beyond capacity as evidenced by ever increasing road closures, children commuting to Hemel and Bucks, and GP wait lists. The Draft Plan admits there is zero committed financial support for maintaining, never mind improving, this existing old and decaying infrastructure in Berkhamsted and as a result will be unable to safely accommodate a further 20% growth in the Local Plan time period. There is significant uncertainty about retail and leisure along the High Street as a result of the shift to more online activities which adds to the stresses elsewhere and appears to have been ignored. Releasing any further green belt land for housing development under these conditions only brings this process into disrepute. Some key pieces of information missing from the local plan is the quantity of land and the names of the large builders who have been awarded greenbelt land in the past 10 years, the time taken for it to be developed, how many homes they built and how much was affordable housing in order to realistically to see whether the Plan is even realistic.</p> <p>We support the deletion of the Ivy House Lane site. However, the development on the south side of Berkhamsted is excessive for the reasons stated above and release of greenbelt land, regardless of whether it will ever be built on, is insatiable and not driven by DBC policy but by builder's profit.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9972
<b>Person ID</b>	1267794
<b>Full Name</b>	Kathleen Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Planning additional homes, which may be constructed to sustainable or environmentally sound principles, are not sustainable nor environmentally friendly when nearby surrounding areas and facilities (Areas of Outstanding Beauty and</p>

Berkhamsted town) are ruined for all whilst trying to accommodate something they were never intended to be used for. Accessing facilities miles away on roads that are not conducive to walking or cycling because of the extremely hilly terrain is factual and means more traffic damage is inevitable.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9973

**Person ID** 1267794

**Full Name** Kathleen Jones

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** This is evidenced by the recent proposal of the Thakeham developers which promotes its housing development requiring release of significantly more greenbelt land between Broadway Farm and Hall Park beyond the 2,200 homes in the Draft Plan. This development would merge the town with Bourne End which is already connected to Hemel and directly opposes established Green Belt policy. Additionally it would create more landscape vandalism approaching the town which would be highly visible, visually unattractive from surrounding areas and spoil views of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed relocation of central sports facilities more remotely from Berkhamsted towards Hemel will involve more traffic across the town and is less sustainable and environmentally unfriendly. This scheme would create more congestion within Berkhamsted.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9975

**Person ID** 1267798

**Full Name** Nicola Mahoney

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9976
<b>Person ID</b>	399950
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Margaret Pike
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object most strongly to the Local Plan set out in your documents. I have lived in Berkhamsted for the last 50 years and have seen a lot of development in the last 10 years which has fulfilled the requirements thus far. The amount of development for both Berkhamsted and Tring is far too much and much of it is on Green belt land contrary to Government guidelines. Brownfield sites should be utilised first . Traffic congestion is already a problem in Berkhamsted and will only get worse. Nobody is going to walk or cycle into town and back from near the A41 so more cars will clog up the roads. There is no infrastructure plan and this is already a problem and will only get worse. The plan states that affordable homes will be built but what proportion will they be ? Recent developments have mostly been large detached houses which are anything but affordable to most people. I am not against development but the size is altogether far too large. I fully agree with the Brag submission .</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9977
<b>Person ID</b>	1267845
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE ORMEROD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to inform you that I oppose the proposed development around Berkhamsted. It is over-development on beautiful green belt. It also fails to address infrastructure to support the proposed growth.  I do not support the proposal.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9989
<b>Person ID</b>	1267849
<b>Full Name</b>	LYDIA MCMUNN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10016

**Person ID** 1267862

**Full Name** ALEX CHAPLIN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

— Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.

— The policies do not take into account the impact of the Covid pandemic. The changes in lifestyle necessitated through the move towards home based and remote working, and increased flexibility towards home/work balance have not been properly taken into account.

— The plan does not take into account the likely increase in empty retail or office space in town centres as a result of the Covid changes, missing a once in a generation opportunity for change.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10018

**Person ID** 1267862

**Full Name** ALEX CHAPLIN

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10035
<b>Person ID</b>	218427

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Bruce Kent
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Traffic Issues.</p> <p>The proposals for Northchurch create specific detrimental issues.</p> <p>The proposal to built next to the canal in New Road, will create 2 unacceptable traffic issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 A) The access will be on to New Road adjacent to the Canal Bridge. This is next to an existing bottleneck at the canal bridge, where there is already queuing at busy times. Visibility will be limited. It is close to a primary school where young children are going to and from school.</li> <li>2 B) The junction with the High Street is also a bottleneck and dangerous. Those on the main road are reluctant to allow traffic to join, and there are cars parked almost opposite the junction.</li> </ol> <p>This location cannot cope with any increase in traffic.</p> <p>The proposals to build in the area towards Shootersway is also flawed. The existing building works will result in increased traffic. We already have traffic congestion in Shootersway with traffic heading for the by-pass and children heading to school, so this will only make that issue worse. For those going to the town, there are already unacceptable options. Bell Lane is not available unless upgraded to allow 2 way traffic. The same problem applies to Darrs Lane, which cannot accommodate 2 way traffic, leaving only Durrants Lane, which has 2 schools on its length so more traffic can only result in a greater risk to children attending these schools. There is no safe stopping point for children attending Westfield First School and there is already substantial traffic attending Edgerton as it is way from the town centre.</p> <p>New Road encroaches beyond an obvious boundary.</p> <p>It is important both to protect green belt and to retain the identity of different localities.</p> <p>The canal provides a “natural” boundary together with New Road, and these barriers should be respected and maintained.</p> <p>Similarly, each housing development in the land between Northchurch and Berkhamsted means that both settlements lose their own identity. This is a of particular concern where the settlements are ancient, where the individual character of each should be supported. Planners require developers to take into account the character of the area so the same emphasis should be adopted by the Authority itself.</p>



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10039
<b>Person ID</b>	1267886
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sophie Barnes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have looked at the plans for development for the Berkhamsted area for the next 18 years and I am horrified at the planned over development of the town.</p> <p>As a long standing resident I have seen the town change a lot, &amp; not always for the good.</p> <p>These plans seem to be trying to squeeze as much as possible into unrealistic spaces. Traffic is always a problem in Berkhamsted &amp; I dread to think what it would be like if the plans go ahead.</p> <p>I also note that a lot of the proposed housing will be built very near flood plains - a dreadful idea, and extremely close to the A41. The traffic noise &amp; pollution for residents (if built ) would be very harmful. There have been many studies showing the negative effects of living close to main &amp; very busy roads.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider these plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10040
<b>Person ID</b>	1150386

<b>Full Name</b>	Siobhan Rothnie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I'm writing to object to the local Plan 2020 - 2038. I live near the Bearroc Park development and am shocked that yet more than another 2000 houses are being planned. This seems ridiculously excessive and is clearly above the housing need for the Borough. I foresee that the enjoyment of what was to be my retirement home will be snatched from my family. The impact on local infrastructure, roads, road safety, schools, doctors and dental surgeries, and the local environment will be severe. It's just not sustainable to have so many more residents here, it already feels overcrowded and congested compared to when I moved to Berkhamsted 15 years ago.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10055
<b>Person ID</b>	1155402
<b>Full Name</b>	Christopher Stafford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The

Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10058

**Person ID** 1267889

**Full Name** Ms Alison Brathwaite

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10059

**Person ID** 1267974

**Full Name** Mrs Alexandra Mills

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10060
<b>Person ID</b>	1267979
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Gregory Mills
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10067
<b>Person ID</b>	1267987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Alastair Harrison

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I object to buildings on this beautiful green space in Berkhamsted. Please don't change the very nature of where we live.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10068
<b>Person ID</b>	399466
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Karin Nield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plan to build 2236 house in Berkhamsted is excessive. The planned development off Shootersway does not sufficiently take into account the nature of the area such as supporting roads. The idea of 1 junction from the A41 will only add to the issue and is ill-conceived.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10072
<b>Person ID</b>	1267996
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Christopher Vile

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have large concerns around the scale of the housing increase which will overwhelm the town centre of Berkhamsted (25% more houses) within an area which already struggles with basics such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Schooling (primary and secondary). I feel this has not been addressed in the plan - its unclear if secondary provision is improved.</li> <li>- open space (we are a narrow valley concentrated around a small high street). There is little open space around the centre, which larger towns normally benefit from.</li> <li>- Road. Especially congestion on roads, this plan does not address the pressure on the main roads which are already incredibly concentrated through the High street.</li> <li>- Town-parking (the new multi story is already full)</li> <li>- Train overcrowding will become much more frequent especially on the return from London.</li> <li>- Town centre - Berkhamsted being a steep sided valley is very concentrated around a small town centre, with limited scope for expansion - with housing closing in all around. There seems little or no solution to this problem if the population is greatly increased.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10074
<b>Person ID</b>	1267999
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Barbour
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10075
<b>Person ID</b>	1268002
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jan Barbour
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10112
<b>Person ID</b>	1268048

<b>Full Name</b>	BEVERLEY WILKINS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I live in (SENSITIVE INFO REMOVED) Berkhamsted and am extremely concerned about the proposal to build around 2000 new dwellings in the town, with the resulting population and car increase it would create.</p> <p>With an estimated population increase of around 15,000 people and 3,000 cars, the infrastructure of Berkhamsted will be severely compromised. The road structure (before Covid) was already badly congested. More people and cars will cause a rise in emissions and lead to even more congestion, particularly in the high street and Kings Road junction area - a major route for local children walking to and from school.</p> <p>Health and education services are already stretched and will also be majorly affected by a surge in the population.</p> <p>Damage will be done to the local environment which is on the edge of the Chilterns and much of the area is currently green belt land.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10115
<b>Person ID</b>	211168
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Day
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object to the current plans in Northchurch. The current plan of 2220 + houses is more than the current infrastructure can sustain.</p> <p>Please accept this email as an objection to the current plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10120
<b>Person ID</b>	1146091
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Also the excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already, yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p>

This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10129

**Person ID** 1268059

**Full Name** CAROLYN SQUIRE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have concerns about the significant numbers of new housing developments proposed in Berkhamsted. My concerns are due to several reasons

- Loss of Green Belt Land in an area which is in the Chiltern Area of Outstanding National Beauty
- Traffic Congestion / Air Pollution - The certainty of significant congestion in the town. The town is situated in a valley so many people drive into town due to not being able to walk up the steep hills. There are already traffic queues in the High Street, Lower Kings Road and on Billet Lane. Berkhamsted has restricted access points due to the railway line & canal and traffic narrowing on the High Street. There are already some roads where the cars park on the pavements, due to the streets being narrow, which means pedestrians are walking on the road & access for emergency vehicles is restricted.
- Water / drainage - living at the top of a hill we have already noticed at times when rain fall has been low that there has been a reduction in water pressure. I understand that there has also been issues with untreated sewage draining into the canal. How with these systems cope with such an increase in new houses?

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10131

**Person ID** 1268060

**Full Name** DEREK AND CATHERINE HARDING

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Dear councillors, I most strongly object to these proposals This is land grabbing on a monumental scale which is completely out of proportion for the area. Green belt land is not there for housing development, it is designated GREEN BELT, to stop urban” sprawl” and protect the character of our small community.</p> <p>The infrastructure in our town struggles to cope with demand at present, expansion on this scale would overwhelm the town.</p> <p>Hospital facilities for the area are centred in Watford and already at full capacity. This extreme development would place an unacceptable demand on hospital services.</p> <p>Therefore , If you truly represent the residents of Berkhamsted I ask you to reject these development proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10132
<b>Person ID</b>	405397
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jonathan Harker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to say that I disagree with the Local Plan and housing numbers proposed. The housing numbers in the Local Plan across Berkhamsted are excessive and wrong.</p>

The impact on West Berkhamsted is disproportionate and does not sufficiently consider existing and recent major developments in the area (Bearroc) and severely impacts infrastructure (roads schools and utilities) congestion, road safety, local ecology, health and well-being both in this part of Berkhamsted and for the town overall.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10133

**Person ID** 405397

**Full Name** Mr Jonathan Harker

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10136

**Person ID** 1268063

**Full Name** GORDON AND ALVINA REID

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to state that my husband and I are strongly opposed to what is being considered for the Berkhamsted area. We do not feel that the current infrastructure will be able to cope with the impact of so many more houses being built. We are already seeing the adverse effect on traffic along Shootersway because of the Bearroc housing development.</p> <p>Please may we ask you to reconsider and demonstrate at the same time a greater willingness to protect valuable greenbelt land.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10137
<b>Person ID</b>	1268064
<b>Full Name</b>	KAREN WILKINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the latest building proposals for 400 more houses in Northchurch. I feel after the last tranche of house building adjacent to Durrants lane that this is a step too far . I think we all appreciate the need for new houses but also it needs to be proportionate to population growth and not totally envelop what used to be villages. Green belt land is being taken without hesitation .. green spaces provide opportunities for wildlife and nature and create quality of life for people.. if you take them away ..you severely diminish quality of life for people and destroy opportunities for wildlife. Please drastically reduce your building proposals for what is now ' West Berkhamsted ' and Tring and consider the impact you are having on the natural ecosystems and the people who chose to live here before it became so congested and potentially so much more so.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10140
<b>Person ID</b>	1268065
<b>Full Name</b>	MARGARET MUSGRAVE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10149
<b>Person ID</b>	1268069
<b>Full Name</b>	MONICA BRANDI
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10155
<b>Person ID</b>	1264713
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Hodge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to state in the strongest terms my objection to proposals contained in the Dacorum Borough Council Emerging Strategy for Growth. This enormous development will have an unacceptable impact on a community I have lived in all my life and the environment in which that community is situated.</p> <p>The effect on Berkhamsted will be devastating and will be felt not just in Berkhamsted but also in the surrounding areas. The lack of provision for increased traffic, water supply and disposal as well as environmental concerns will be widespread. In particular I am extremely concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on and loss of Green Belt land, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation</li> <li>- Over-provision of housing</li> <li>- Failure to address climate emergency issues</li> <li>- Impact on infrastructure and local community</li> <li>- Likely water and water waste disposal issues and damage to chalk streams</li> <li>- The lack of brownfield regeneration proposals.</li> <li>- Over-reliance on growth strategies and partnerships which have not been subject to public consultation and scrutiny.</li> <li>- The Plan is at odds with the recent government desire to address the imbalance of investment between the north and south of England. Post-Covid in particular it is likely that there will be a reduced requirement to live and work in London and the South East.</li> <li>- There is no provision for the increased numbers of school places needed in an area where there is already pressure on our local primary and secondary schools. The same is true for healthcare and GP surgeries.</li> </ul>

- I also understand that the company involved in this development is a significant contributor to the Conservative Party, which does little to ensure an objective assessment of the project by a council led by the same party.

In short this is an ill-conceived plan which does little to address the concerns of local people and will in the long term create far more pressure on a small town whose resources and services are already being stretched to the limit.

I trust that my objections will be added to the record and taken into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10159

**Person ID** 1268071

**Full Name** LINDA SLIM

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.

— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.



— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition). Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses. There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street and these houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns. This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10161

**Person ID** 1268074

**Full Name** Jonathan Whittle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

*Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10169
<b>Person ID</b>	1268080
<b>Full Name</b>	Patrick and Lorraine McIntyre
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please accept this email as notification of our disagreement with the proposed local plan for Berkhamsted and Tring. In particular the number of houses proposed is ill-considered and unacceptable.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10173
<b>Person ID</b>	1162178
<b>Full Name</b>	Lucy Walton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to object to the Berkhamsted local plan.

The plan proposes a 24% increase in housing in Berkhamsted. The infrastructure of the town cannot support such a huge increase in population the scale of housing development is totally inappropriate for our town.

The inevitable increase in traffic and pollution particularly along the High Street, the King's Road and Shooters way would have a very negative effect on air quality in the town. This is a particular concern for our children walking to school and growing up in the town.

I am also against building on Green belt land and the loss of our beautiful countryside. Why are further brownfield sites not being considered?

This level of development will ruin the town. It will cause so much congestion and pollution and effect the lives of everyone currently living here.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10176

**Person ID** 1259999

**Full Name** Paul Peters

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted</p> <p>As a resident of a small side road off Swing Gate Lane I am extremely concerned about the proposals to irreversibly damage the character and beauty of the towns greenbelt, not to mention the destruction of habitat for wildlife and damage to rural green space.</p> <p>The plans to utilise greenbelt take away the areas people use locally to exercise, which will lead to more people driving to seek green spaces to enjoy fresh air.</p> <p>The proposal to build houses represents a 24% growth in houses in Berkhamsted and a 30% growth in urban footprint fundamentally changing the rural and countryside character of the Berkhamsted borders.</p> <p>Large-scale development will place significant pressure on local infrastructure, particularly the local highway network.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10181
<b>Person ID</b>	1268084
<b>Full Name</b>	KATIE FERGUSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>To build on my support for BRAG ;, there are a number of concerns that have been raised around the viability of this plan, particularly around the impact in significantly reducing existing green belt land (going against government recommendations) and putting increasing pressure on the town's already strained infrastructure. There are no clear exceptional circumstances that can provide a reason for this type of rapid over development. Berkhamsted and Tring</p>

are both towns where the surrounding countryside is a significant factor in their character, appeal and history, with the proposed plans drastically reducing this and having a significant negative impact for residents and visitors. As someone who sees outdoor recreation as a key part of their lifestyle, this also will destroy my (and others) enjoyment of the green space that surrounds Berkhamsted, with the ease of reach being a key factor in its appeal. The green space is home to hundreds of diverse species and environments; building on it will further damage flora and fauna.

As more and more towns across the UK are being “swallowed up” by vast amounts of housing and attempts at regeneration, Dacorum should not go in the same way. The road and traffic infrastructure is not sufficient to handle additional volumes, and there is no ability to “create more roads” therefore it will only add to the problems of congestion and pollution as has been identified. The locations of the proposed sites at the top of the valley will only exacerbate - many will choose to avoid walking or cycling up the hill and therefore have an even greater multiplier effect on the number of cars being used. Similarly, having commuted from Berkhamsted into London for a number of years, it is incredibly evident that trains are already at (and over) capacity.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10184

**Person ID** 1268085

**Full Name** Dorothy & Peter Norman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We would like to add our objections to the proposed Local Plan published by Dacorum Borough Council on the following grounds:-

- Environmental impact of the number of dwellings proposed
- Traffic Increase in and around the town
- Congestion
- Pollution
- Employment

- Local transport
- Infrastructure
- Greenbelt Erosion

2200 dwellings in Berkhamsted seems to be an overprovision of dwellings and will change the character of this historic town. This will drastically increase the traffic flow through the town due to the siting of the new dwellings and adversely affect all residents. The transport system will not support this proposed population increase. Congestion and pollution will increase thus affecting the acceleration of climate change.

Limited employment in the area means that people will have to travel elsewhere for work making the town more of a commuter belt than it is already.

We object to any plans leading to the erosion of green belt spaces. Planning policy states that the Green Belt should not be developed except in exceptional circumstances. This plan goes against the idea of the green belt which was designed to prevent the sprawling of one town into another.

The loss of these spaces will impact not only on the town but its residents. During this pandemic, the importance of these spaces and their use have been clearly demonstrated. Walking through the countryside via its footpaths and bridleways has been a life saver for many people helping them to maintain physical and mental wellbeing.

Houses built in our area are almost all out of the price range of local young people. What is really needed is affordable homes and social housing.

The infrastructure to accommodate the additional population in the town including surgeries, schools and sports facilities does not seem to be factored into this proposal. They will be critical in ensuring a happy and relaxed populous.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10185
<b>Person ID</b>	1268086
<b>Full Name</b>	NATALIE LONG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>I can accept the need for the provision of new properties, however I the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost, putting a large amount of wildlife at risk plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>I'd urge a revisiting of this proposal in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10194
<b>Person ID</b>	1268096
<b>Full Name</b>	TRACEY DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to oppose the consultation on the Northchurch/Berkhamsted housing development plans.</p> <p>I feel that this consultation should be stopped as like many of the Northchurch residents we have been inadequately informed of such a substantial and obscene housing development taking place.</p>

The plans to develop 2200 houses within Northchurch would create an immense impact on the traffic where the infrastructure is already struggling to cope! There is no mitigation on traffic in the proposed plans only crossings and tactile paving at crossings. Northchurch already has an issue with speeding and drivers regularly going through the lights at Northchurch. A child has already lost their life to the lack of traffic measures and many more children potentially may succombe to theirs as part of the government's poor planning. Increasing homes to this area would be obscene to such a small town with limited resources.

Among other relevant reasons to oppose would be our gorgeous green belt which is currently over subscribed and wildlife areas, the canal and not to forget our schools. Can our area and the pollution really cope with all these houses and extra vehicles ?

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10209

**Person ID** 1268108

**Full Name** PAUL YARKER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Having read the plans for new developments, I would like to voice major concerns over the lack of facilities (sports in particular due to the loss of some sports ground in the plan) already in Berkhamsted and Northchurch. These proposed development sites would create even more pressure and there seem to be no plans to deal with this.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10212

**Person ID** 1268163



<b>Full Name</b>	RONA GIBSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to you to make some points regards the Dacorum Local Plan 2020 to 2038</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 I know that the deadline has already been extended for the consultation. However I feel in the current circumstances when the population is in the midst of a third lockdown that not everyone's thoughts have been able to focus on this Dacorum Local Plan. Hence I would like to propose that the deadline is extended again.</li> <li>1 Some of my concerns</li> <li>1 a) From 23.120 " There are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town. The careful location of new development and promoting opportunities for sustainable travel, will in part help tackle a number of parking and traffic issues. "</li> </ol> <p>The main artery from the A41 in to Berkhamsted - Kings Road A416 - is a narrow road and is already extremely busy during peak times and this will become more congested. Shootersway will be affected greatly by the increase in traffic as a result of the large development in the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 b) Please can you detail if there are now any further proposals for waste management ... "The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required." From Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan Appendix B - Berkhamsted Schedule.</li> </ol>

1 c) This is near an Area of Outstanding Beauty and I do wish reassurance or some explanation that this will continue to be so for future generations to enjoy and relax in.  
The increase in population could have an enormous effect on the Ashridge Estate.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10216
<b>Person ID</b>	1268165
<b>Full Name</b>	ANNETTE BUCKINGHAM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name and my husband's name
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10217
<b>Person ID</b>	1268166
<b>Full Name</b>	TIM BUCKINGHAM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name and my husband's name
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10218
<b>Person ID</b>	1268167
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRIS YOUDELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Hello please re think your plans for development in Berkhamsted. If you intend to build more houses you must build new schools and new sports facilities  thanks
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10232
<b>Person ID</b>	1268167
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRIS YOUDELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10236
<b>Person ID</b>	1268174
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH ROLLINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>T The huge impact on overstretched infrastructure</b> that the proposed increase in housing will have, including the burden on already overstretched medical services. The huge housing developments proposed for Tring and Berkhamsted and the 400 houses planned for Northchurch will cause gridlock in Northchurch High Street as well as the B4506, New Road, which is a major route from Northchurch through Ashridge to Dunstable.  The 60 houses planned for the tiny strip of land at Lock Field on the B4506 is untenable: the small, single-track road that goes over the historic canal bridge is already overburdened by the current heavy levels of traffic.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10238

<b>Person ID</b>	1268174
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH ROLLINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>The burden on our local Water supply and sewage disposal systems:</b></p> <p>The water table and water supply in Northchurch in particular are already under huge pressure and the precious River Bulbourne chalk stream is already threatened. The extra housing proposed by the Local Plan would require substantial investment in infrastructure improvements in order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage and we do not believe this has been taken into account.</p> <p><b>YOUR RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Comments should be submitted to Dacorum Borough Council by 11.59pm on Sunday 28th February, either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 By post to: Strategic Planning, Dacorum Borough Council. The Forum, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire. HP1 1DN</li> <li>2 Or, by email to: <a href="mailto:responses@dacorum.gov.uk">responses@dacorum.gov.uk</a></li> <li>3 Or, using the on-line consultation portal</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for registering our Objections to the Local Plan 2020 – 2038, 'Emerging Strategy for Growth'</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10241
<b>Person ID</b>	1268177
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID ROLLINSON

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>T The huge impact on overstretched infrastructure</b> that the proposed increase in housing will have, including the burden on already overstretched medical services. The huge housing developments proposed for Tring and Berkhamsted and the 400 houses planned for Northchurch will cause gridlock in Northchurch High Street as well as the B4506, New Road, which is a major route from Northchurch through Ashridge to Dunstable.</p> <p>The 60 houses planned for the tiny strip of land at Lock Field on the B4506 is untenable: the small, single-track road that goes over the historic canal bridge is already overburdened by the current heavy levels of traffic.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10243
<b>Person ID</b>	1268177
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID ROLLINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The burden on our local Water supply and sewage disposal systems:</b></li> </ul> <p>The water table and water supply in Northchurch in particular are already under huge pressure and the precious River Bulbourne chalk stream is already threatened. The extra housing proposed by the Local Plan would require substantial</p>

investment in infrastructure improvements in order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage and we do not believe this has been taken into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10244

**Person ID** 1268181

**Full Name** DAVID JOHNSON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am resending this email to include my post code as I gather this may be required.

*Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10245

**Person ID** 1268182

**Full Name** JOEL STERN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10247
<b>Person ID</b>	1268190
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Chris Walton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the Berkhamsted local plan.</p> <p>The plan proposes a 24% increase in housing in Berkhamsted. The infrastructure of the town cannot support such a huge increase in population the scale of housing development is totally inappropriate for our town.</p> <p>The inevitable increase in traffic and pollution particularly along the High Street, the King's Road and Shooters way would have a very negative effect on air quality in the town. This is a particular concern for our children walking to school and growing up in the town.</p> <p>I am also against building on Green belt land and the loss of our beautiful countryside. Why are further brownfield sites not being considered?</p>



This level of development will ruin the town. It will cause so much congestion and pollution and effect the lives of everyone currently living here.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10248

**Person ID** 1268194

**Full Name** Ms Emma Jones

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  
The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10249

**Person ID** 1158669

**Full Name** Ingrid Carola McKenna

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	To save you the necessity of reviewing a repetition of the comprehensive and clear points made by the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) in response to the consultation, please accept this email as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10250
<b>Person ID</b>	610573
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Helen kington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10251
<b>Person ID</b>	1268201
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Helen GALLOWAY

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10252
<b>Person ID</b>	1268203
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Matt Galloway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p>

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10253

**Person ID** 1268207

**Full Name** Ms HANNAH FIELD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10254

**Person ID** 1268205

**Full Name** LESLEY LYNCH

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents' Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the Consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish Dacorum Borough Council to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10255
<b>Person ID</b>	1144389
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sarah Tester
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation. The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.  In addition, I have not seen any mention of the development currently being built in Plx Lane? The advertising encourages usage of Berkhamsted...there must be upwards of 100 homes being built there. Are these also within the plan and what numbers will we actually see that will want access to facilities and infrastructure of an already busy market town!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10256

<b>Person ID</b>	1145788
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Felicity Bond
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10257
<b>Person ID</b>	1264346
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Friend
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please find my comments on the plan.

The Dacorum Local Plan (to 2038) does not sufficiently consider the government’s Ten Point Plan for a Green Industrial Revolution (Nov 2020), or the government’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (April 2017) – and may consequently leave the council vulnerable to legal action.

Specifically, the references in the Plan regarding contributions to “off-site enhancements to the local road network” do not clearly delineate plans for traffic calming measures and segregated cycle lanes/footpaths, which would reduce air pollution and increase the viability of walking and cycling for short journeys in Berkhamsted.

West Berkhamsted currently has an average of 1.48 motor vehicles per household, in 2,401 households. According to the plan, the proposed development in the West Berkhamsted area will create 1,860 households – which will lead to 2,753 additional motor vehicles on Berkhamsted roads, with next-to no commitment to sustainable local travel provision for the thousands of families in the town.

Most of the additional motor vehicles will frequently use Shootersway and Kings Road for commuting and town centre access. The junction of these two roads has already seen a deterioration in air quality since the opening of Bearroc Park and the multistorey car park. The air quality at the junction of the high street and Kings Road has also degraded in the same period. Both junctions are a thoroughfare for school children as they make their way to local primary and secondary schools – currently with negligible infrastructure to support them.

The current version of the plan does not adequately address four of its own objectives: ‘Mitigating and adapting to climate change’, ‘Conserving and protecting the natural environment’, ‘Promoting and facilitating sustainable transport and connectivity’ and ‘Supporting community health, wellbeing and cohesion’. If these points are not addressed, then the council may endure protracted legal proceedings.

As a Berkhamsted resident, a mother of two children, and a strong advocate of sustainable transport for short journeys, I will not stand idly by as my children’s ability to move safely around their hometown is compromised.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10258

**Person ID** 1162740

**Full Name** Jon Bond

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10260
<b>Person ID</b>	1268211
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Gray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>In addition to BRAG's responses, I would like to make the following comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkhamsted is a ribbon town - with one main road running through it that carries most of the traffic going into / out of town and from one end of town to the other. It already suffers from traffic jams (some weekends, it can take huge time to get anywhere) - adding that many more dwellings will make this situation untenable</li> <li>• Berkhamsted has a real parking issue and does not have the capacity for that amount of additional dwellings</li> <li>• The additional school proposed is at the other end of Berkhamsted to where a large part of the dwellings will be which makes little sense</li> </ul>



- The “South Berkhamsted” part by Swing Gate Lane is not properly connected - and will rely on sending a huge amount of traffic down one or 2 currently quiet roads - one of which has a primary school on it
- The above are just a few examples of the fact that Berkhamsted does not have the infrastructure (or indeed the space to expand the infrastructure) to support such a large increase in the population
- Developers want to build in Berkhamsted as it has a premium - would Dacorum not be better served by building a new town / village such as it with Pistone
- This strategic plan / development is being pushed through without sufficient publicity from the council - I have not seen / heard anything from the council (town / Dacorum / government or otherwise) and am relieved that the town has enough of a “social” network for me to find out from fellow residents. Why is this not being publicised ?
- I understand that the government are in the process of reviewing how much housing each authority is required to build - why is this review not waiting for that to complete

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10267

**Person ID** 1268218

**Full Name** FRANCES & DAVID STEPHENS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please be aware that my husband and I strongly object to the proposed development plans for Berkhamsted, particularly on the South side of the town which include a considerable amount of Green Belt land.

I have lived all my life in Berkhamsted, having been born at Ashridge during the Second World War, and my family have been in Berkhamsted for generations. I cannot agree that this enormous number of houses is needed in this town which is situated in a valley of the Chilterns. There are already insufficient doctors and convenient hospital facilities to accommodate the present population as well as other services and the town is suffering from road congestion. Shootersway has already become an unofficial bypass!

I could go on and on but hope you will seriously rethink your plans.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10270
<b>Person ID</b>	1151968
<b>Full Name</b>	MR DAVID BROWN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Consultation Response to Dacorum Borough Council in relation to Draft Local Plan 2020-2038. These comments on the Draft Local Plan are with particular reference to Berkhamsted.</p> <p>*Firstly, I would like to say that the growth proposed for Berkhamsted is far too much. The plan proposes an increase of around 24% in the number of dwellings. Most of which are located within land designated as Green Belt. This sort of expansion unacceptable where “historic character and setting” of a market town like Berkhamsted needs maintaining. A point that was recently made by government ministers.</p> <p>*The population increase will overwhelm the current infrastructure, much of which cannot be altered or improved to accommodate the increase. Hospital facilities are already inadequate for the area, being some of the worst provision in the country, and even the proposed changes will not cope with the expected increase from this and other areas of development. Care Home and other care services just cannot cope with current numbers let alone the proposed increases.</p> <p>*The transport infrastructure and facilities in Berkhamsted are inadequate and over stretched. HCC have already concluded that there is NO scope for improving traffic flow in the town and particularly the High Street. The increased traffic will increase emissions and produce further pollution. The congestion will inevitably result in the creation of more “rat runs” in the town where traffic seeks to avoid delays thus further endangering pedestrians, children, cyclists etc.</p> <p>*The proposed developments mean more traffic. Car growth in the town is inevitable as public transport is inadequate. The hilly nature of the town means that it is not easy to get around on foot or bike. The car is the only option for the majority of residents, particularly for the older generation. The schools proposed will also result in extra traffic at peak times. Again, an increase in emissions as it will be many years before any changes in car propulsion comes into effect. All detrimental to the town and the environment. The building of so many houses in itself is environmentally unfriendly.</p> <p>*Water and sewage management is a major issue. Our local chalk stream, the Bulbourne, is one of unique few, which are sadly disappearing, and is at risk. The water supply to the town is already nearing capacity with the limits on aquifer extraction. There is likely to be insufficient supply for the large developments without damaging the chalk stream.</p> <p>It would appear from reading the document that the 2013 Core Strategy has been ignored as it states, that developments of this nature on Green Belt land will not happen. This conflicts with Ministerial Statements in December 2020 regarding</p>

the release and use of Green Belt land. Why? Where is the logic? Why Change? Why promote the development and hence removal of Green Belt Land which cannot take into account the landscape and scenic views in the area? The area is used by walkers and ramblers so removal of this amenity will likely result in more travel as residents seek recreation in the countryside. The immediate and wider countryside close to and surrounding Berkhamsted has become more important and of greater value to residents particularly resulting from the current Covid-19 pandemic. There is every reason to believe this will continue even after the virus is contained or even beaten. This access to green spaces is essential for better mental health of the wider population.

It is important to remember that Green Belt land should, and can only be changed with the support of the local people – In my view YOU do not have this support from the local people of Berkhamsted. The Borough has only sort views via electronic means. No public forums, and a very inconsistent distribution of the Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation document. I am aware that many households in Berkhamsted and surrounding villages did not receive this document. For households without internet facilities the opportunity to meaningfully reply to the consultation was not available. Please think again - do not take our Green Belt Land and over stretch still further our services, health and care provision.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10271

**Person ID** 1264434

**Full Name** Gemma Dalton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  
The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS10272
<b>Person ID</b>	1268222
<b>Full Name</b>	GILL DOBBY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object very strongly to the proposed development plans for Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I feel the town is already very heavily populated and the younger generations are unable to afford to stay here independently and have to continue to live within their family home or leave the area. I think it's outrageous to build thousands more houses that they still won't be able to have any change of affording and these new houses will be bought by people from outside the area, overpopulating Berkhamsted even more and giving no thought whatsoever to its younger residents.</p> <p>The infrastructure is already straining to cope and nothing is suggesting it will be improved enough to enable it to do so.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10274
<b>Person ID</b>	1268224
<b>Full Name</b>	ABI HALL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Having reviewed the material sent through I have the following concerns:

- I understand the need for development and the need for housing but the numbers proposed seem excessive and disproportionate. If an average household consists 2-4 people, 2236 houses assumes an extra 4472-8944 residents of the town by 2038. Based on the town's current population that's growth of approximately 25-50%. I question what figures have been used to calculate that Berkhamsted needs this many houses or has the infrastructure to sustain this level of growth?!

- These proposed numbers have serious implications for Berkhamsted's already creaking infrastructure. Has the local plan considered the impact that the Phase 1 and Phase 2 of Bearroc Park have already had on the local infrastructure?

- The proposed plans look to be developing on precious greenbelt land.

-Traffic has increased considerably in the 15 years I have lived in the town. The town centre is congested most days - at all times of the day. As a resident of (address removed) traffic is regularly backed up along the main thoroughfare out of town and at peak times it can take as much as 15-20 minutes to drive less than half a mile to the A41. It's hard to see how more housing along Shooterway won't exacerbate the existing problem.

- Ashlyns as the only state secondary school within the town is already over subscribed with some children in recent years from neighbouring villages not getting a place - unless the new plan involves a secondary school it's hard to see how there won't be issues with school places.

- The timing of this consultation is unfortunate. Many people are juggling the demands of work and home-schooling and will have struggled to find the time to respond to this.

- The forms to respond are cumbersome and not intuitive to the lay person, hence my emailed response!

Whilst we may not be experts in planning, as residents we are qualified to know what life is like already in the town. If the town centre is congested and the pavements are crowded during a national lockdown how can the infrastructure of our town cope with a further 2236 houses?

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
--------------	-------------------------------

<b>ID</b>	EGS10281
-----------	----------

<b>Person ID</b>	399324
------------------	--------

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Julie Hollway
------------------	------------------

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
---------------------------	--

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>SP22 ("Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted") is not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3. ("West Berkhamsted" is essentially Northchurch, a village.)</p> <p>The development around Berkhamsted will disproportionately impact on the village of Northchurch. Northchurch is a separate village to the town of Berkhamsted with its own Parish Council and a small historic centre. That fact is scarcely acknowledged by the draft Local Plan simply treats Northchurch and the sites within it (including Bk06 and Bk07) as an extension of Berkhamsted, newly billed "West Berkhamsted" (Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 - 2038), p.230. By contrast, the Local Plan treats locations such as Markyate, Bovingdon and King's Langley as villages where concerns around sustainability, congestion and the restricted range of services and facilities mean that development should be limited. (E.g. pp.66, 247.). At present, Northchurch is known to suffer from air quality problems, and has a declared Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in the High Street, signifying that national air quality objectives are unlikely to be achieved. Adding extra traffic burdens to the village (which also has no excess parking capacity) will reverse the recent small improvements in the air quality recorded at that location (Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, p.22: it is noted that there is only one 'normal' year (2019) of data in which the air quality at the location improved. Although DBC reported that NO2 concentrations remained below intervention limits in 2020, the periods of lockdown are likely to mean that the year is not representative.)</p> <p>Like Berkhamsted generally, it also suffers from a lack of open space within the town. (Berkhamsted (including Northchurch) has the second lowest level of current provision in the borough. DBC Open Space Study Assessment Report, July 2019, Table 6.1 (p.31), <a href="https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/open-space-study-assessment-report-july-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=f6e0c9e_4">https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/open-space-study-assessment-report-july-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=f6e0c9e_4</a>.) In those circumstances, the public rights of way into the Green Belt countryside around Northchurch (such as that which runs off Bell Lane through site Bk06 - known by local residents as the 'Wishing Tree field' - see further below) are extremely valuable. The sudden decision by DBC in early 2020 to close all pedestrian access from South West Berkhamsted across the A41 has made such space still more important. While it is proposed that certain sites within the draft Local Plan (including Bk06) should include new public spaces within them, that is far inferior to the ability to gain direct access to the open countryside of the Green Belt. These proposed green spaces, which will inevitably be small, are a poor substitute for open country.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10288
<b>Person ID</b>	1268236
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE ROBERTS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Of the various documents which I have read, I find that the response provided by the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group is the best reflection of my views.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10291
<b>Person ID</b>	1268244
<b>Full Name</b>	LINDSAY KELSEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly disagree with the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed for 1700 more houses on Shootersway, Kingshill Way and the Chesham Road.</p> <p>You need to look very carefully at the infrastructure, especially Shootersway which is already used as a rat run. The road was not designed to take the number of cars that currently use it and is in a terrible state. Your plan would involve many more cars and this is not acceptable to residents.</p> <p>There is going to be very little green space left in this area and I would like Dacorum BC to rethink their Local Plan and, they should, consider residents who live here and take a pride in their properties and frontages when they do.</p> <p>For every new property you propose building in this area equals 2-3 more cars. How can Shootersway, Kingshill Way and Chesham Road possibly cope with your proposal showing 830 new houses accessed via Shootersway.</p> <p>A while ago because of the incompetence of builders erecting new properties in Kingshill Way, residents were without their utilities. The road was shut for a week while repairs were carried out. Locals could not easily access the town. More</p>

inconvenience. It seems Berkhamsted and Tring would be paying a very high price for your proposed Local Plan. Please reconsider.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10292

**Person ID** 1268245

**Full Name** NAVIK PATEL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10293

**Person ID** 1268246

**Full Name** SHRINA PATEL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10295
<b>Person ID</b>	1268251
<b>Full Name</b>	NICOLA GALLAMORE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Further to the consultation on local plan 2038, I would like to put forward my disagreement with the local plan, and the far too high number of housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>The town has already changed in the 5 years we have lived here - near Shootersway - and adding in yet more houses will increase the pressure on roads, doctors, schools, parking, and above all the town will start losing its appeal which attracted us in the first place. We must protect our green belt from over development</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10298
<b>Person ID</b>	1268255
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON BURDEKIN

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am responding to the Dacorum Local Plan, as a resident of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I understand the need for more housing stock as well as genuinely affordable housing, however, these plans dramatically exceed what is needed, considering the environment.</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is located within the green belt 'buffer zones' between the towns and in between the A41 and towns. These are used as a noise and pollution buffer zone which segregated a polluting A road from the towns and its inhabitant.</p> <p>I would like to comment on the follow issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pretty much all proposed development will be on Greenbelt. – this goes against current Government policy not only building but on the climate crisis too.</li> <li>• The land between the top end of Berkhamsted and the A41 was created as buffer zone for absorbing traffic pollution. This is unhealthy and damaging to people's health considering the increased volume over the years.</li> <li>• Brownfield/Greyfield sites should be considered. This has been done across the country at former power stations (Rugeley) and old Armed Forced bases amongst other sites.</li> <li>• As Berkhamsted is a valley, it makes it more difficult to cycle and walk and the use of cars will be greater adding to the already dangerous levels of pollution, especially as we see an increased ageing population.</li> <li>• We have seen in recent years the need to maintain and increase the eco-system and for the natural world to thrive. Removing this habitat is adding to this problem now and for future generations.</li> <li>• Water is in very short supply within this area and with the erosion of the chalk streams we see the River Bulbounne dry in the summer months. More drainage will only add to this issue.</li> <li>• The UK and the world is in a climate crisis. Building large properties on green belt land where the car is essential is a regressive and out dated policy. It is our responsibility to protect tomorrow for future generation. It is not our responsibility to caress the developers palms to keep their shareholders happy. There are much more sustainable ways and sites to build new housing.</li> <li>• There are widespread and mainstream calls to rewild our green areas, plant more trees, create bigger natural eco-systems to help our carbon emissions. All of these plans go against that.</li> <li>• Air pollution is killing more people in the UK than cigarettes and alcohol abuse. Many of our towns have staggeringly high levels of harmful particles especially at peak times.</li> </ul>

- The natural valley that Berkhamsted sits in makes it a holding pen for pollution so any increased particles will disperse slower.
- We should be using the most up to date figures regarding air quality in Dacorum. They are currently not accurate or relevant.
- Most of these properties are way above, not only the national , but local average house price. Affordable housing is more of a priority than expensive and executive properties, but this is where the developers make most of their profits.

If we are going to tackle this climate crisis, massive considerations need to made, not token gestures that have no impact. Many of the people making these decisions, as with myself will not be around to see the disastrous consequences of 'our' actions. It takes bold and caring leaders to challenge these sorts of plans and act in the interests of those who will suffer.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10301

**Person ID** 1268261

**Full Name** JANET LANE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to register my horror at the plans to build so many more houses in and around Northchurch, Berkhamsted and Tring. It's planning gone mad, you refuse planning for one small dwelling for my elderly parents in my green belt garden but find it acceptable to build thousands of houses on local green belt land. Does that mean my planning application is acceptable now?

New Road Northchurch can't cope with the traffic on it now as it's used as a rat run from the A5 and there have been four accidents on the sharp bend in as many weeks. When you have a narrow country road that has to funnel over a single lane canal bridge leading into the frontage of a primary/ junior school close to the junction to the High Street it seems senseless to make matters worse by adding further housing into the mix, therefore more cars. It's all about money for someone but not the local residents.

Berkhamsted is a small market town in the bottom of a valley whose geography alone doesn't lend itself to adding more housing. The infrastructure to support that just isn't in place nor is there any place to improve it.  
 Tring is similar.  
 I can only object to the mindlessness of it all in the strongest possible terms

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10307
<b>Person ID</b>	1268271
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE BRAZIL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm writing to raise my concerns and oppose the plans for the new developments planned over this time...</p> <p>We are Northchurch residents, with the plans in place this will impact not only us but my two boys also...</p> <p>Our school walk is already dangerous enough it's the way the traffic and amount of traffic that use new road... with one of the proposed sites this will just make it totally unbearable ... the bridge on new road will just not be able to handle all the construction vehicles or once built all the new traffic this will bring... the junction at the top of new road is would also not be able to cope.</p> <p>The schools are already over subscribed and by adding new houses this will only add to the issue.</p> <p>— The overall number of houses proposed - 16,899 across the borough — is just not justified by the latest statistics on projected population growth</p> <p>— massive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will cause gridlock in Northchurch High St as well as the 400 houses earmarked for Northchurch itself</p> <p>— The grounds for encroaching on the Green Belt have not been made out - the law says we can only build on the Green Belt if it has proven to be necessary - this is simply not the case!</p>

— Insufficient value has been put on the Green Belt both in terms our mental and physical wellbeing and the impact on climate change  
— Northchurch has been written out of existence - it is being subsumed into West Berkhamsted

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10311

**Person ID** 1268339

**Full Name** Mr Adam Craig

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Do you have any specific comments about any of the delivery strategies?**

The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10320

**Person ID** 1268350

**Full Name** Mrs Tamsyn Craig

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Do you have any specific comments about any of the delivery strategies?</b></p> <p>The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10326
<b>Person ID</b>	1268360
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Anna Schuele
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10327
<b>Person ID</b>	1268362
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Simon Wigg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10330
<b>Person ID</b>	1144307
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Lumb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 <b>Local Infrastructure:</b> There are a number of topics that appear to be completely overlooked in preparing the plan for Berkhamsted:</p> <p>3a) <b>Water and Sewage capacity:</b> There is a need to need to maintain the unique chalk streams in the area. In this connection the Environment Agency has capped abstraction from the local aquifer at current levels. The Sustainable</p>

Assessment identifies the need for additional capacity for the Borough as early as 2031. Furthermore, there is no mention in the plan as to how increased sewage treatment capacity would be provided – it may not be sufficient to say that developers would be responsible for implementing this.

3b) **Roads provision and congestion:** It is disingenuous to suggest that the large number of new dwellings postulated would not significantly increase the congestion in the town of Berkhamsted. Most of the postulated housing sites are too far from the centre to allow for pedestrian access, and in any case people would have to walk uphill with their shopping to almost all of the postulated housing locations. In terms of road traffic, with only one crossing in the town centre, there is no scope for new roads or widening in central Berkhamsted. Traffic is already congested, and the traffic lights are already overloaded at busy periods.

3c) **Medical and Social Care:** Over recent years social care has been reduced rather than increased, with the closure of the day-care centre in Manor Street, and closure of the Dementia ward at Gossoms End. There seems to be no provision in the plan for augmenting the GP services in Berkhamsted, which are already under strain, to meet a population increase in the region of 23-24%.

3d) **Employment:** If population is to grow by 24%, there will be a need for increased employment in the town of Berkhamsted, otherwise incoming residents would have to rely on commuting either by car or train. This would add to the overall carbon footprint by the increased emissions, and in any case there would be insufficient parking available for those who wished to access the railway station by motor vehicle. At the same time, it seems completely wrong to allocate the industrial site in Billet Lane (No 11 – ‘Jewson Site’) for housing, when it should be reserved for employment sites.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10331
<b>Person ID</b>	1144307
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Lumb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
<b>* Yes</b>	



* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 <b>Overarching Comment:</b> I am a member both of the Berkhamsted Residents' Action Group and of the Berkhamsted Citizens' Association. <b>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation, and Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb, Chairman of the Berkhamsted Citizens' Association, has submitted a response on behalf of all members of that body. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in both of these responses, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's and BCA's responses – in their entirety - over my name.</b></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10336
<b>Person ID</b>	1268406
<b>Full Name</b>	IAN CHEESE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><u>Reaction to Draft Reg 18 Local Plan 2020</u></b></p> <p>-</p> <p>Consultation point BKDS</p> <p>Officer code OBJ GRBT GRO INFR AHST COVID BCA</p> <p>I have recently been made aware of the above document by being involved in discussions with other members of Berkhamsted Citizens Association. I have now also read the Association's official response to your document and whilst agreeing with and wholeheartedly supporting it, I would like to highlight some specific concerns.</p> <p>1 The lack of publicity that you have given your Plan and the corresponding lack of opportunity given for response by the community suggests you feared the reaction it might cause – and with good reason. For Councillors who are elected by the community to produce a Plan that fundamentally damages that community and its environment is, to say the least, unacceptable.</p>

1 GREEN BELT. The over-arching principal for the existence of the Green Belt, as laid down by the then current Minister, is that "...its boundaries should be adjusted only in **exceptional circumstances** ..... and **with the support of local people**". He also stated that "...demand for housing alone will not change Green Belt boundaries". No exceptional circumstances are apparent in your Plan and it certainly does not have local support. Furthermore, the Government has stated that their housing numbers are not targets, despite DBC's view, and that the Green Belt should be afforded "...the highest protection...". No evidence of any care for the Green Belt appears in your Plan and the catalyst for the Plan does appear to be solely an unjustified desire to build yet more houses.

1 More houses mean more people and more cars.

Berkhamsted town centre **traffic** is already at capacity as borne out by existing congestion at most junctions.

**Water and sewage** facilities are also operating at capacity with the Environment Agency having capped water extraction at current levels.

Provision for increased **school** capacity is inadequate and its funding unclear.

No provision has been made for improved **medical and social care** for the enlarged population.

1 For Berkhamsted to thrive it must retain its unique identity. These plans and others for the area between the town and Bourne End will dramatically erode the town's identity and change it into a large, undefined urban sprawl.

The value we place on our natural open spaces is being demonstrated daily during the current pandemic. The population does not take its exercise in existing structured green spaces but in the glorious natural surroundings that are an essential part of living in Berkhamsted. I hope you will re-consider this appalling and unjustified assault on all that the community holds dear.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10342

**Person ID** 1268418

**Full Name** JOSEPHINE O'NEILL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.</p> <p>This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.</p> <p>The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10354
<b>Person ID</b>	1264502
<b>Full Name</b>	R Phipps
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

TheBerkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG)has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid fill repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10358

**Person ID** 1268423

**Full Name** Miranda and Alan Cummins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We are horrified by the Draft Plan 2020 which provides for the excessive increases in the population and number of houses to be built over the Plan period 2020 -2038. We cannot agree to this as the projections by ONS do not support the increase planned for. Adopting the proposals in the Draft Plan results in substantial incursions into the Green Belt, including sites on the edges of Berkhamsted, with adverse impact on parts of the AONB. The impact of Covid 19, will mean that large numbers of shops and office premises will be asking for change of use to residential, this has not been taken into account.

The current household build rate per annum in Berkhamsted is nearly twice that targeted. At the current rate most of the estimated target capacity will have been deployed by 2020 (11 years ahead of target) while the rest of Dacorum lags behind target. Such disparities within Dacorum must be taken into account when assessing development numbers and site options going forward.

It is manifestly the case that the infrastructure of Berkhamsted is not fit for purpose in relation to current needs let alone any future housing development of the scale proposed by this Draft Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10366

**Person ID** 1268429

<b>Full Name</b>	MR & MRS K WRIGHT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are emailing to express our concern for the proposed development in and around the Berkhamsted and Tring area. Our family has lived in Berkhamsted since the 1800s. Personally we have lived here for nearly 70 years and we have grandchildren and siblings living in Tring. We love this area and feel so blessed to live here. However, we are becoming increasingly concerned about the over development of this area. One of the many blessings of living here has been the green belt land that surrounds us – an area we believed would never be built on.</p> <p>We are concerned that building contracts will be given to developers wanting to make as much money as they can from building expensive houses in this prime location. We understand that some starter homes are planned to be built but is there any provision for houses with small gardens (not flats or apartments) that older, local residents could buy thus freeing up more family homes? As we get older we do not want to be forced to move out of this area, and away from our grandchildren and support network, when the time comes for us to downsize.</p> <p>We are concerned that over development will not be supported by improvement in the infrastructure. During normal times it only takes one car to be parked or broken down in the wrong place for the whole town to become gridlocked, especially during rush hour. It is the same if the bypass is closed for some reason.</p> <p>We understand that it is necessary to provide housing for the growing population. However, we are concerned that the plans are just ticking boxes to fulfil requirements dictated from the government rather than addressing local needs.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10368
<b>Person ID</b>	1263273
<b>Full Name</b>	Amy Shackell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It was so hard to comment on the plan itself with a small device that I'm emailing directly instead.</p> <p>I've reviewed the plans for Berkhamsted and immediately surrounding areas in dismay. The proposals are extraordinary- I can't believe the size of the areas proposed for development and the absolutely negligible provision proposed to support such an extension to the local population size.</p> <p>Lockdown has shown many people the value of our open spaces. Whilst I am aware that housing is needed to accommodate the growing population, it mustn't be at the expense of all else and without adequate service provision. I am against the local plan as it currently stands - the scale and damage that it will cause to the town's identity, services and the environment is far beyond requirement and puts profits before everything else.</p> <p>I would urge decision makers to significantly cut back on the scale of land identified in this exercise.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10370
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted is a historic and larger market town with a proposed increase of @10% on top of the big Bearroc phase 1 and 2 developments already generating over 200 new houses, and already creating traffic issues along Durrants Lane and Shootersway. A 2 bed semi costs in excess of £450k, hardly affordable housing. This has become a very desirable

commuter town over the last few years, but will this still be the case after covid with numbers moving out of London and a lot less commuting/more home working? What effect will all this have?  
In terms of design., little regard is had to existing local vernacular, these are urban housing developments being proposed.

**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS10374**Person ID** 493957**Full Name** Mrs Anne Galewski**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** I live on the border of Berkhamsted and Northchurch, and it a demonstration of how much out of touch DBC are when the refer to Northchurch as part of Berkhamsted.**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS10382**Person ID** 1268431**Full Name** MARY CRABB**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have been a resident of Berkhamsted for 34 years and am writing to you to register my strong objection to the Dacorum Housing Plan.

I am not clear whether this plan is the result of Central Government policy or local Government policy or local Government's thoughtless reaction to this policy. In either event I would like you to reflect my views when discussing these proposals.

Whilst acknowledging that more houses are required these should be on Brown Field sites and not on Green Belt. The main problem with this massive increase in housing in Berkhamsted is the lack of infrastructure:-

Roads - With the exception of the A41 bypass, roads have not improved in over 30 years. Traffic has massively increased and the state of the roads have deteriorated.

Water - We know that with hot summers water supply is limited and the aquifer will not support an increase in demand of 25%.

Parking - Many roads on the south west side of Berkhamsted have residents' and commuters' cars parked on both sides of the road and use the pavements to allow single file traffic.

Employment - Most working residents commute into London. Why does the Government insist on developing the South East when levelling up to the North of Britain is their aim.

Green Belt - Do we really want to make Berkhamsted another concrete jungle?

Facilities - Developers always claim they will provide schools, dentists, doctors and hospitals etc. Since we moved here in 1987 I don't recall seeing any increase in facilities in spite of massive development of housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10406

**Person ID** 1268432

**Full Name** SARAH STUBBS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p> <p>This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10445
<b>Person ID</b>	1268448
<b>Full Name</b>	Matthew Patience
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10463
<b>Person ID</b>	1268450

<b>Full Name</b>	JOSEPH STOPPS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	DACORUM GREEN PARTY
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 Green Belt: This plan inflicts a 25% increase in housing for Northchurch and Berkhamsted: 2250 homes of which 1750 are on existing Green Belt land (78%).</p> <p>Various Governments have made numerous statements in support of the protection to our precious Green Belt over the years. As recently as December 16th 2020 this Government, in a published a response to the recent white paper consultations stated, with reference to protected landscapes and Green Belt, "We should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." This draft plan makes a mockery of such statements as the growth in homes across the borough is driven entirely by a national target that bears no relation to actual local need, topography or infrastructure.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (19 February 2019) (NPPF) states: "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (Paragraph 133 NPPF)." Releasing Green Belt land on the scale envisaged in this draft plan ought to be difficult to justify since paragraph 136 of the NPPF is totally clear that: "Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans." The "exceptional circumstances" that could justify release of Green Belt land on such a scale are simply not evidenced in these documents.</p> <p>1 Character: the town is recognised for its charm and character. The 2013 Core Strategy affirmed the Borough's commitment to maintaining the unique linear valley configuration of the town and recognised the importance of preserving the ridge skyline. Most of the sites chosen are on the southern ridge above Northchurch and Berkhamsted thus renegeing on that commitment and creating a massive urban sprawl that fundamentally would alter the character of the town.</p>

- 1 Connectivity: It is already acknowledged that the town centre is prone to excessive traffic. These new homes are predominantly sited over a mile away from the town up the steep valley sides. There seems to be no acknowledgement that the associated additional traffic flow cannot be accommodated. There is no scope for widening roads to facilitate traffic flow and the main cross roads in the centre of town is already at logjam for much of the day (outside of Covid restrictions). There are no bespoke cycle ways in Berkhamsted and the existing footpaths that could connect these sites to the central hub were constructed as narrow high sided gloomy corridors.
- 1 Environmental damage: the Green Belt is not just a "nice to have" or just a route for people to pass through. Important as these things are the Green Belt is also a thriving mature habitat for vegetation, animal life and water retention. Destroying this natural environment cannot be replaced by planting a few trees somewhere else. Natural habitats have evolved over centuries and cannot be manufactured anew elsewhere. The soils are a valuable source of water retention that prevents flooding down into the town but also allows the water to seep through the layers to replenish in part the aquifers upon which we rely for water.
- 1 Water and sewage: there are already water shortages in the area and the River Bulbourne chalk stream is now regularly prone to drying up, again destroying generations of natural habitat. The water companies can only supply the necessary water by degrading these amenities further. Until a national water network is developed so that water from

plentiful areas can be moved cross country to areas of water shortage this fact alone should prevent building on this scale.

- 1 Employment: the plan is completely out of balance. 2250 new homes requires 4000 new jobs. Where are these jobs to be found in this plan? Almost none in Berkhamsted and in fact the Jewsons industrial estate is to be repurposed for residential housing. Despite some likely post-covid increase in home working these developments will create even greater traffic flow as people drive either to the A41 or through the centre of town to Tring, Hemel Hemstead or cross town to the station. This makes a mockery of the sustainable communities pledge in the strategy guidance documents of last year. It also guarantees further increases in CO2 emissions thus undermining the climate emergency pledges made.
- 1 Medical and Social Care: Despite the addition of an expected 6,000 people there are no plans to increase the already overstretched medical, dental and social care facilities.

1 Recreational provision: not only does the filling in of all this Green Belt land mean that for the existing residents pedestrian access to reach natural countryside but there is little commitment in this plan to maintaining high quality access and green corridors. There is no commitment to increased parkland provision - considered essential for child development and mental well being. There is a shortage of sports pitch provision and despite the release of Haslam Fields, currently a sports field owned by Berkhamsted School, no additional provision is

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10481

**Person ID** 1268458

**Full Name** IAN STACEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10490

**Person ID** 1268461

**Full Name** Emma Preedy

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10505
<b>Person ID</b>	1268462
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Preedy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS10508
<b>Person ID</b>	1268608
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW CLARKE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the "Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038) plan" and in particular the ludicrous plans to so dramatically increase the housing stock in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>Both towns already suffer from insufficient capacity in the following to service the existing populations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctors</li> <li>• Hospitals</li> <li>• Policing</li> <li>• Parking n town centres</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Sports facilities</li> <li>• Transport links into London</li> <li>• Parking at Berkhamsted railway station</li> <li>• Supermarkets</li> <li>• Restaurants and pubs</li> </ul> <p>Neither town has the capacity to deal with further traffic in what are already overcrowded roads that were built for a time before the motor car.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10513
<b>Person ID</b>	1155372
<b>Full Name</b>	Sheila Dawkins

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I came to Berkhamsted in 1979 so have seen many changes to this historic market town, allowing many more people to live in this beautiful place as well as providing enhanced facilities and amenities. To be able to walk out of my house into the Green Belt and surrounding Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty has always been important to me, more so over the last year.</p> <p>I am concerned that further development does not spoil our environment and do not support the above plan for a number of reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The basis on which the plan is drafted</li> <li>2 The effect on the Green Belt</li> <li>3 Climate emergency issues</li> <li>4 inadequate infrastructure</li> </ol> <p>Basis of the plan</p> <p>The plan uses the 2014 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections to determine housing need but fails to take into account the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which expects local authorities to use the latest available information. The latest ONS 2018 based projections would show a significantly lower, but more up-to-date, estimate of housing need.</p> <p>Effect on the Green Belt</p> <p>Taking Berkhamsted including Northchurch, the proposed growth in dwellings of 24% is too much for the town and virtually all of it is proposed to be built on Green Belt, to which I object.</p> <p>In June 2016 the Minister of State for Housing and Planning wrote a letter to MPs confirming “demand for housing alone will not change Green Belt boundaries” yet that is the reason here. On 16 December 2020 the Government published a response to the recent white paper consultations, and states “we can and must strive to build more homes, but to do so with sensitivity and care for the environment, heritage and the character of existing communities”. Development of</p>

Berkhamsted should be consistent with the Core Strategy [2006 – 2031] adopted in September 2013. The house building rates and the Green Belt releases around the market towns that were suggested in some options (in the 2017 proposals) are a significant departure from existing policies in the Core Strategy. Adopting an option that requires large Green Belt releases around the market towns would mean that the Settlement Hierarchy described in the Core Strategy will have been abandoned notwithstanding what is asserted in the Draft Plan. The Core Strategy must carry significant weight in the development of the Local Plan.

#### Climate emergency issues

A requirement of the NPPF and the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act is that plans demonstrate a pathway to local carbon reductions. Local plans need to contain evidence-based carbon reduction targets and ensure these targets are then central to their new planning policy. The plan as proposed does not meet these obligations

#### Infrastructure

The Infrastructure Development Plan to support the planned growth fails to adequately address issues including traffic, water and wastewater, and is incomplete. This reflects the reality that infrastructure always lags the development it is meant to serve and this has been very obvious in Berkhamsted. Berkhamsted has a congestion problem and does not have a sustainable transport system as Dacorum Borough Council suggests. Building on steep valley sides and along ridge tops at a distance from facilities will exacerbate problems, and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. It is more likely for the car to be used to access the town centre, as opposed to walking or cycling.

As a member of Berkhamsted Citizens I am committed to the conservation of the historic built environment of Berkhamsted. This includes Northchurch and its internal green spaces, and the retention of the surrounding Green Belt which protects them. Green Belt is the single most important buffer against the coalescence of settlements, the erosion of which will threaten Berkhamsted's distinctive and discrete nature if this Dacorum Local Plan (2020 - 2038) is adopted as it stands.

#### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
--------------	-------------------------------

<b>ID</b>	EGS10517
-----------	----------

<b>Person ID</b>	1142719
------------------	---------

<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Jonathan Brazier
------------------	---------------------

#### Organisation Details

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10518
<b>Person ID</b>	1268610
<b>Full Name</b>	MARY WESSEL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm writing to voice my deep concerns about the Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth. I've lived in Berkhamsted for over ten years - and chosen to bring my son up here - mainly for the fact that it is a small, friendly town with beautiful green spaces. I'm concerned that the proposed plans will erode both the character of the town as well as, crucially, the green spaces that are imperative to our personal wellbeing and the survival of this planet.</p> <p>My specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether we need this level of additional housing. Are the projections you are using the most up-to-date? It appears they are based on 2014 council projections, not more recent 2018 ONS figures.</li> </ul>

- Nearly all the proposed development is on Greenbelt - this is against Government policy. I'm particularly concerned about the destruction of green spaces in Darrs Lane (BK06), Haslam Playing Fields (BK03) and the land between Hanbury's and the A41 (BK04).
- There are no proposals to improve walking / cycling routes.
- There are no significant proposals to support the additional traffic flow in this already congested town - and with most new housing being at the top of the hill, residents will naturally rely on their cars more. We need to make our town more sustainable, not increase the toxic load.
- The planet is already struggling. The last thing we need is to build on the very areas we need to protect. If we destroy these green spaces, they will never return. And the proposed 'wildlife corridors' referred to in the proposed plans are frankly tokenistic and would go nowhere near balancing out the destruction caused by building housing that the community doesn't want, or need.

I sincerely hope these plans will be reviewed and that the panel has the intelligence and foresight to push back against them.

#### Included files

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10519

**Person ID** 1268611

**Full Name** FRANCES LLEWELLIN

#### Organisation Details

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

#### Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

#### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10522
<b>Person ID</b>	1145758
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Alexander Thomas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation.</p> <p>To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10524
<b>Person ID</b>	1268614
<b>Full Name</b>	DONNA HOGAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The recent and current developments along Shootersway Lane have resulted in an increase in traffic which the junction at bottom leading to A41 cannot cope with and causes un necessary congestion and pollution along roads used by school children to walk to school. This area will not be able to support more housing as is already overcrowded for roads available.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10535
<b>Person ID</b>	1268621
<b>Full Name</b>	EDWARD CADDIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Under the proposal Berkhamsted, which is already recognised by Dacorum as possessing insufficient infrastructure currently, will face decades of problems until the infrastructure catches up with the proposed enlargement, if indeed this will ever be realised.A high priority for the region and Berkhamsted in particular, should be to provide affordable housing and while this is referenced in the proposal, history and reality shows that in Berkhamsted, developments fail to include sufficient affordable housing – despite promises at the planning stage- and any developer contributions are redirected to other areas or infrastructure. Hence the aspiration is illusory.The employment-generation proposals are under-developed. This is concerning for two reasons; the lack of ambition and planning by Dacorum will mean less economic growth and fewer opportunities for young people and secondly; the consequential further unhealthy concentration of towns like Berkhamsted into almost exclusively dormitory towns for London commuters.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10543
<b>Person ID</b>	1268671
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Mike Jennings

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The delivery strategies are inappropriate because the premise of the housing need / development growth is not sustainable and lacks justification because the council has over estimated the requirement for growth, exceeding the Governments requirements. Dacorum is a Borough with a large area identified as of environmental importance. The present demands on the environment are causing a deterioration in the environment. Hence the proposed growth will further damage the environment, especially around Tring and Berkhamsted. Mitigation measures are required that will result in Net Environmental Gain NEG (as identified in the NPPF). A high quality environment surrounds these towns, albeit deteriorating due to current recreational pressures. Sufficient measures to provide NEG are not feasible within the local environment. Offsetting the impacts elsewhere will not compensate for the impacts on the local environment. This will inevitably lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the SAC, SSSI's and local areas of importance to biodiversity.</p> <p>These adverse impacts do not comply with the local policies and national legislation.</p> <p>Delivery strategies in the plan need to take into account the latest information with respect to carbon, nitrogen and nutrient neutrality issues (In Practice December 2020, Page 6 Nutrient neutrality; Air pollution Pages 7-10; Nitrogen pollution Pages 11 - 14). The reference provided has other articles that are also relevant in the context of all local plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10559
<b>Person ID</b>	1268702
<b>Full Name</b>	Kirstin Chaplin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>4/ Do you have any specific comments about any of the delivery strategies?</b></p> <p>—The delivery strategies rely on the release of Green Belt land. There is no justification for the release of this land. The housing target is not a true reflection of objectively assessed need for the area. The Green Belt across the Borough is really important to people who live here now, but also for future generations. It is our duty to preserve the Green Belt in perpetuity. This plan fails in this duty and I cannot support this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10585
<b>Person ID</b>	1268722
<b>Full Name</b>	ALEX DEANE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Personal reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I moved from an urban area to Northchurch because of it's semi-rural location and with a desire to seek out fresher air for our asthmatic Son. Despite our location on the edge of an AONB, there have already been higher than expected levels of pollution measured, even during lockdown periods. The additional car journeys due to the proposed plan would have a huge detrimental effect on the air quality;</li> <li>• My (SENSITIVE INFORMATION REMOVED) sons attend St Mary's school and we already have considerable safety concerns due to the narrow pavements and busy roads running through We have suffered the death of a young girl on the busy main road in recent years and the Northchurch Go20 residents group was established to deal with the considerable traffic issues faced in the village;</li> <li>• My family and I regularly use the public footpath on the site in Darrs Lane for an easily accessible nature The loss of this would have a detrimental impact on our physical and mental health;</li> </ul>

- We live adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The over-development of green belt here, over and above more suitable urban and brown field sites, would be a tragedy for this country and for future generations.
- I believe the process of consultation has been flawed, with many residents unaware of the existence of the plan. We received a brochure from Dacorum this Tuesday, 22 February (postmarked 21 February 2021), giving us only 5 days to respond during a national Coronavirus lockdown and while working, homeschooling two young children and caring for a 90 year-old. I do not feel this is anywhere near a reasonable attempt to engage me in consultation on a major proposal to develop the borough.

I trust that you will now make the right decision to re-visit this flawed proposal, engage properly with the whole community, investigate brown field and urban sites in the borough which are more suited to development. You have a chance now to place great importance on protecting our green belt (in line with Government policy, see Appendix 1) and safeguarding the countryside, its biodiversity and, ultimately, the planet for future generations.

#### Appendix 1

An excerpt from The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green belts are their openness and their permanence.

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- 1 a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2 b) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3 c) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- 4 d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and redundant land

#### Included files

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10587

**Person ID** 1268723

**Full Name** MARGARET HAWKINS

#### Organisation Details

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This email is in response to the consultation on the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth, please can you include it in the consultation responses.</p> <p>We are opposed to the proposals for Berkhamsted, for the reasons well articulated below by CPRE and with whose views we agree. While we understand the need for additional housing, the scale of the proposals for Berkhamsted would completely change the character of the town, and the reason why we and others have chosen to live here.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10609
<b>Person ID</b>	1268729
<b>Full Name</b>	MONIKA LESTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>No, you as a council should realise that we should always keep our countryside as a countryside and not demolish it into housing it's ridiculous and beyond a point where we went to go after when everything turns into houses because it's selfish and greedy and quite cruel to the rest of the environment and for everyone that lives around.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10640
<b>Person ID</b>	1268735



<b>Full Name</b>	Marie-Clare Anderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to you to voice my concerns with regards to the proposed Dacorum Local Plan (2020 – 2038). I have lived in Northchurch for the past 6 years and have started raising my family here, becoming part of the local home from home nursery and St Marys Primary School. Over the past 5 years we have seen a large increase in the amount of traffic using the high street through Northchurch. As we have to cross and walk alongside this road with young children on a daily basis, we are increasingly anxious about the proposal for 400 houses to be developed in Northchurch itself as well as in Berkhamsted and Tring. The High Street from Northchurch through Berkhamsted already gets backed up during morning rush hour and the junction with Tesco Express congested with idling cars. In addition, the junction between the High Street and New Road already causes tail backs and is very dangerous to cross, not only during school open and close times but at regular times throughout the day. The proposed developments will only increase the levels of traffic as well as greatly increase the emission levels right next to St Marys Primary School, which incidentally has already stopped using their front play area due to high levels of emissions.</p> <p>Whilst reading the local plan, I was disappointed in noting that Northchurch is referred to as West Berkhamsted, Northchurch is a close-knit community with a tight community around the church, the allotments, school, nursery and café with great village camaraderie, we even have our own Northchurch Parish Council. It is sad that the identity of Northchurch is gradually being erased.</p> <p>Not only is Northchurch due to receive a large proportion of housing compared to its current size but the amount of housing to be absorbed by the surrounding towns of Tring and Berkhamsted in particular, is huge. I cannot understand how the government have undertaken this calculation to build this excessive amount of housing, 16,899 across the borough, and question the validity of the algorithm they have adopted.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10644
<b>Person ID</b>	1264163
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Stevens

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Just a quick email in response to the “Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation” and specifically the developments of Berkhamsted (the several sites along Shootersway).</p> <p>We object to this proposal on the basis that the concentration and numbers of dwellings proposed far outstrips the infrastructure (local roads, parking and facilities) available to support them. An additional 2000 dwelling scattered around Berkhamsted would be less of an issue but dropping a majority of them where they will use one road already fairly busy road (especially at school pickup/drop off) for access seems to be badly thought out.</p> <p>Additionally we are very concerned about the impact in air quality and road safety, Shootersway is sufficiently far away from Berkhamsted for most of it’s residence to drive into town. Local traffic generated by these new developments, as well as additional commutes and school/child care runs along roads which children are walking along to get to the schools on Kings Road and Shootersway seems reckless. Before we moved to Berkhamsted we had already seen first hand what happens when excessive development occurs too close to schools and it would be a shame to see it happen in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>So whilst we are not opposed to a more scaled back development of these sites or a development of only a couple of these sites we are opposed to the plan as it stands.</p> <p>We have only recently move to Berkhamsted and can confirm it is already hard to access local resources such as schools, child activities/care and local parking.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10689
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I quote from BRAG's excellent summary "Policy SP1 really isn't worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Masterplans to the detriment of both the development and community , while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as "successful new communities", "best approach to", "best practice", "comprehensive green infrastructure", "multifunctional space", "an exemplar in sustainable living" etc. etc. etc. BRAG particularly takes issue with "5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy." As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted, while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport."
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10726
<b>Person ID</b>	1145421
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Shirley White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS10745
<b>Person ID</b>	1145586
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Hannah Moynehan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS10805
<b>Person ID</b>	1268438
<b>Full Name</b>	LINDA GUNARY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am emailing you to express my objection to the proposed development outlined in Dacorum Borough Council's document entitled "Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 – 2038).</p> <p>As a resident, I implore DBC to reconsider this plan which imposes massive over development on an already stressed environment, with severe implications for the integrity of the Green Belt and our status as an AONB (in fact the 2019 Glover report recommended that the Chilterns should be given National Park Status). Our countryside is precious and finite and it is therefore critical that land is not lost to development unnecessarily.</p> <p>The following are my principal objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Over development of protected green belt land, the Chiltern's AONB and the Chiltern's Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation. In addition I would remind the Council that it has a LEGAL duty to protect the AONB and its environs.</li> <li>2 Over provision of housing. The council has not used up to date figures to calculate housing need. Using the most recent official government projections, from 2018, should result in a housing need calculation that is around half of that currently proposed in the plan. As a consequence of using the older 2014 ONS data, the proposed plan will destroy 850 hectares (the equivalent of approx. 1,214 football pitches) of precious Hertfordshire Green Belt land, countryside, and urban green spaces to build 16,596 new homes.</li> <li>3 Failure to address climate concern issues. Local Plans are legally obliged to contain evidence-based carbon reduction targets and ensure these targets are then central to their new planning policy. The proposed plan does not meet these obligations.</li> <li>4 Impact on infrastructure. The plan as proposed does little to address the improvements in infrastructure required to support the increase in housing. It ignores issues such as traffic congestion, education provision and healthcare requirements.</li> <li>5 Water supply and waste water. The level of new housing proposed will put a severe strain on water supplies in the Dacorum area especially during dry summer months. Until new water supplies are available from elsewhere in England, which will not be until the 2030s, the only option would be to extract additional water from the chalk aquifer which in turn</li> </ol>

would damage the borough's three chalk rivers which are classified as priority habitats under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. In addition the proposed plan makes no mention of how improvements in wastewater and sewerage infrastructure will be funded and the time period for their completion. If this is not addressed potential pollution of watercourses, especially in times of storm, is extremely likely.

6 Brownfield regeneration. In the light of recent events (Covid and Brexit) and trends in the retail sector, the government allows commercial and office space to be converted to residential (as well as adding additional storeys on top) without need for planning permission. This new opportunity appears to have been ignored in the preparation of the proposed plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10817

**Person ID** 1268768

**Full Name** Amanda Stafford

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

(23)

Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

(24)

This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

(27)

National Policy and Guidance – Plan isn't consistent with NPPF because it doesn't offer the protection for Green Belt that the NPPF demands and prioritises Green Belt development over brownfield/urban development.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10818

**Person ID** 1261210

**Full Name** MALCOLM Elderfield

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10819

**Person ID** 1268777

**Full Name** Chris Elderfield

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10820
<b>Person ID</b>	1268778
<b>Full Name</b>	Emily Elderfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10821
<b>Person ID</b>	1268779
<b>Full Name</b>	Hannah Elderfield



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10822
<b>Person ID</b>	1268780
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Elderfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10823
<b>Person ID</b>	1268781
<b>Full Name</b>	Jeremy Elderfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10824
<b>Person ID</b>	1268782
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Elderfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10825
<b>Person ID</b>	1268783
<b>Full Name</b>	Julie Dell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10826
<b>Person ID</b>	1268784
<b>Full Name</b>	Katy Dell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal responses to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, we request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10835
<b>Person ID</b>	1268791
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH FULLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>BK01</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for releasing Green Belt land for development in Berkhamsted has not been made and was rejected by Councillors in the previous Core Strategy. However this very large site results in the irreversible loss of over 33 hectares of our valuable green belt and the loss of the buffer between the town and the A41. Residents on the site would be subjected to considerable increased airborne and noise pollution from the A41.</li> <li>• The ridge top position of the site makes it highly visible from the surrounding hills.</li> <li>• The site is beyond the natural walking and cycling range from the existing services and facilities in the town centre (including the Railway Station) especially due to its position at the top of steep hills.</li> </ul>

- As the Local Plan does not include any new employment sites, inevitably most residents will have to commute to and from work and a significant number of those would have to do so via the station. This would massively increase traffic up and down Swing Gate Lane, a road with 2 infant/junior schools located upon it. If the east/west link to Chesham Road materialises it may mitigate against some of the increase in congestion around Swing Gate Lane and the Hall Park estate roads but would be of no benefit to the wider community and would contribute to the feeling that the site is semi-detached from Berkhamsted, therefore making no contribution to the vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'. The suggestion of a new community hub acknowledges that the site does not integrate with the town.
- There are frequent sewage/waste water issues at the bottom of the Hall Park estate (by the A416), suggesting the current sewage system is already struggling to cope. There is no explanation in the plan as to how this would be mitigated.
- Unless there is any new health provision on the site there would be pressure upon the existing GP's who are already at capacity.
- 'As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' - this is disingenuous. It is not possible to deliver a net gain while removing a large area of Green Belt and the buffer (and wildlife corridor) with the A41.
- 850 homes would probably result in around 2000 people and 1200 cars. It is unacceptable that the Council could impose that level of housing growth all in one area of the town without having clear plans to improve the existing infrastructure
- **For all the above reasons, I object to the use of this site.**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10900

**Person ID** 1268814

**Full Name** Ms Emma Cotton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.</p> <p>This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.</p> <p>The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians – both from cars driving too fast and pollution risk.</p> <p>People already drive well above 30 miles an hour on our road, (address removed), there are frequent car rage incidents, I am terrified that my son will be knocked down on this road, he's 10 years old, it's a constant worry as people just see this road as a cut through quick route to town and out and down to the station – there has been absolutely no thought on how people access the town centre.</p> <p>Sureley we are meant to be learning lessons from the covid pandemic and build back better? To quote Boris Johnson himself.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10907
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted has the challenge of its location. The centre of the town was built in the 19th century. With narrow streets and no off-street parking. In the 20th Century the town continued to expand until the periphery is no longer in walking distance of the centre. There are no routes for new roads to relieve traffic congestion. The existing roads are not capable of handling the existing traffic. I disagree with the Draft Plan to build 2,200 new houses on the edge of town. Most of these will be large family houses which will not be affordable on local wages. No explanation has been provided as to how the town's road and transport system will be able to cope with the resultant journeys that will be generated.</p> <p>I disagree with the Draft Plan that seeks to provides for excessive increases in the population and number of houses to be built over the Plan period 2020 -2038 for the town. With some 500 dwellings planned in Northchurch Parish and around 1700 in Berkhamsted, this equates to a 24% increase in dwellings. Most of the proposals are located within sensitive ridge top locations in Green Belt. More specifically 40% of new houses, around 740, are proposed with access via the same road! namely Shootersway. The Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction is not coping safely with the existing peak day road traffic. The pavement on Shootersway at the Kingshill junction is dangerously narrow. No specific proposals have been suggested to improve traffic flows.</p> <p>Notable for their absence are proposals that link or integrate the sites into the local community including the town centre with new roads/walking/cycling/footpaths, and together with prospective costs that must be included in the Plan.</p> <p>The last sentence of paragraph 23.121 is an aspiration without any foundation to support it. The Plan offers no substantive detail of the necessary strategic infrastructure or sustainable transport options, to provide access to the town centre and station, from the proposed development sites, other than by car. The referenced 'Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy' [Para 23.122] is not supported with any tangible plans. It merely refers to junction enhancements at relatively minor side roads and crossings within the urban area and new/ widened footpaths along Shootersway.</p> <p>As a resident close to Shootersway it is difficult to be objective and to not be caught in a 'Not in my back yard' mentality. Yet the current facts and projections do not support the draft Plans. Therefore, I disagree with the Local Plan. The number of houses built should be significantly lower than the target to reflect actual demonstrable need for housing and the high proportion of Green Belt and AONB land in Dacorum. A higher proportion of the houses should be built on brownfield</p>

land, or established through conversions, in the existing urban areas of Hemel Hempstead, Tring, Berkhamsted and Kings Langley, and away from areas located in the Green Belt (which should only be used in exceptional circumstances) and the Chilterns AONB and its setting.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10918

**Person ID** 1268851

**Full Name** Mr Humphrey Gillott

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to make a few comments about the “Key Developments in Berkhamsted”, if I may, please.

**Durrants Lane.**

On your map of Berkhamsted, the area at the top of Durrants Lane, between the Egerton-Rothesay Middle and Upper School and Shootersway, is an area that is coloured “Green”, which, according to your “Key”, is “Open Space”; in fact this area is filled with housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10924

**Person ID** 1268859

**Full Name** Mr Christian Wallace

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10925
<b>Person ID</b>	1268861
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Wallace
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10926
<b>Person ID</b>	1268863

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Hilary Dann
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10927
<b>Person ID</b>	1265021
<b>Full Name</b>	Charlie Mills
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10961
<b>Person ID</b>	1268886
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Jayson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10967
<b>Person ID</b>	1268896
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sue Holland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to put forward my strong objections to the proposed Local Plan for Berkhamsted with the construction of 2236 houses in the coming future, particularly those developments planned for Shootersway and Kingshill Way.</p> <p>My reasons are listed below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic The traffic levels along Shootersway and down our road (Cross Oak) are off the scale now. With school run vehicles and delivery vehicles, people going to work etc, the traffic is nose-to-tail morning and late afternoon. There is only one speed restriction which has little effect, and in our opinion Cross Oak Road should be a limited access road because of its use as a cut through /alternative to Kings Road. With the obvious proximity of Bearroc Park, which is increasing in capacity, traffic will be at maximum levels by the end of the year anyway. The local roads are not designed for high levels of traffic, tarmac regularly breaks down, and the narrowing with no pavements puts pedestrians at risk.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure Berkhamsted's facilities are bursting at the seams NOW. Doctors surgeries are over-subscribed and not able to take more patients, schools are full. With the added injection of 2236 new households (potentially 6,500 + people) I fear the town will implode on itself.</li> <li>3. Preservation of Berkhamsted as an historical town. Berkhamsted is a market town with a lot of history. It needs to remain and retain its identity in the future. Please pass these views on to Dacorum, and ensure they are put forward for discussion at the Council Meeting on 24 February.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10968
<b>Person ID</b>	1268898
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Graham Holland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to put forward my strong objections to the proposed Local Plan for Berkhamsted with the construction of 2236 houses in the coming future, particularly those developments planned for Shootersway and Kingshill Way.</p> <p>My reasons are listed below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic The traffic levels along Shootersway and down our road (Cross Oak) are off the scale now. With school run vehicles and delivery vehicles, people going to work etc, the traffic is nose-to-tail morning and late afternoon. There is only one speed restriction which has little effect, and in our opinion Cross Oak Road should be a limited access road because of its use as a cut through /alternative to Kings Road. With the obvious proximity of Bearroc Park, which is increasing in capacity, traffic will be at maximum levels by the end of the year anyway. The local roads are not designed for high levels of traffic, tarmac regularly breaks down, and the narrowing with no pavements puts pedestrians at risk.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure Berkhamsted's facilities are bursting at the seams NOW. Doctors surgeries are over-subscribed and not able to take more patients, schools are full. With the added injection of 2236 new households (potentially 6,500 + people) I fear the town will implode on itself.</li> <li>3. Preservation of Berkhamsted as an historical town. Berkhamsted is a market town with a lot of history. It needs to remain and retain its identity in the future. Please pass these views on to Dacorum, and ensure they are put forward for discussion at the Council Meeting on 24 February.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10969
<b>Person ID</b>	1268899
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Gabrielle Reffell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to raise my disagreement with the proposed planning strategy with regard to the number and location of the houses, lack of current facilities and the effect it would have on the town. Being a resident in the local area I feel as if I can comment on the issue as it will be affecting my family and I if undertaken.</p>

Having moved to Berkhamsted, as a family we were attracted to the greenery around the area. We had come from a built-up town and wanted a change. It is disappointing that the attraction points of Berkhamsted have the possibility of being built on, under what I contest to be exceptional circumstances.

The first point I would like to raise is the number of houses that are being referenced to in the proposed plan. This does not give reference to the number of people that it will bring to the area, but as it is affordable housing this indicates to there being more than one person. With a large number of people coming to the area with will have an effect on facilities, for example the doctors, parking and access to the town. The current facilities in Berkhamsted are already struggling with accessibility, most noticeable when trying to book a doctor's appointment. If this is the current situation then this will only be exacerbated if more houses are built. This would mean even longer waiting times for appointment and limited access to receive the treatment needed. This would suggest the need of a new doctor's surgery, costing more time and money that it might be worth.

The second point I would raise is the current condition of the roads and accessibility into Berkhamsted. Due to there being one main access point into Berkhamsted, via the A41 onto the A416. At times of rush-hour, there currently issues of congestion and traffic. Especially along the A416 leading up to Ashlyns School, there have been a number of times when I have had to que on the A41 before even getting on to the slip road. This is dangerous as cars going past do not slow down and others cut in the que as they do not want to wait. This will only get worse due to this being the main access point into Berkhamsted. Another point I would like to raise about the roads are their current condition. Going down Kingshill way to the Highstreet at the moment there are big potholes that are impossible to miss if another car is coming the other way. With more people driving and lorries that will be undertaking the building work this will make them worse. If the potholes increase in size and volume, there will be more chance for cars to get damaged and more complaints to the council. Moreover, this would entail that the council will be constantly checking the roads, more than they are now. More time money and effort will have to be provided in order for the roads to be properly maintained.

The third and final point I would like to make is the effect of this volume of houses and building work would have on the town. The proposed plan says that these changes will take place from 2020 to 2038. That is 18 years of building work, construction and noise pollution that will take place in the area. This time span will take away the current serenity of the area. It will drive away wildlife and wildflowers that currently reside in the areas planning to be built on. It will drive away people that come to the area for walk to enjoy the peace and beauty that we currently have in Berkhamsted. It will increase the pollution of the area with more cars with the burning of fossil fuel and more waste that people with thrown away. It will intensify the current problems we have with accessibility to the doctors, parking and the general access to the town.

Overall, I think that the number of houses in such a concentrated area will cause large irreversible problems to Berkhamsted. As reference to above the facilities that are currently overwhelmed will continue to struggle or worsen with the volume or people proposed to be brought to the area. The congestion will increase around the town and will make Shootersway busier than it currently is, as people will use it as a cut through. Furthermore, it is disappointing to see that the greenery in and around Berkhamsted will be taken away for houses, doing irrevocable damages to the wildlife in this area.

Thank you for reading my email. I hope you take my points into full consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10970

**Person ID** 1268901

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs Ron & Ann White

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** We understand that it is a proposed under Local Housing Plan to considerably increase the number of planned houses in Berkhamsted by 25 % , also in Tring by 55%.

Please delay the consultation until after the covid restrictions are over.

It appears to us that the extra houses will overload our local facilities – such as schools, doctors, hospitals, roads and maybe sewerage and water supplies and transport facilities. Nor is it evident that there are sufficient local employment opportunities for such an increase in population.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10972

**Person ID** 1268902

<b>Full Name</b>	NICHOLAS MORGAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am very much opposed to the local plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 Lack of secondary school. Ashlyns is already over subscribed. To build this many houses with a secondary school in the plans will lead to serious problems for school provision in the area.</p> <p>1 Overdevelopment will exacerbate existing traffic problems. There are already choke points that will get far worse with this level of development.</p> <p>1 Destruction of greenbelt. It's tragic that so many natural habitats will be destroyed when surely there is alternative brown belt land that can be redeveloped first.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10975
<b>Person ID</b>	1268903
<b>Full Name</b>	ANGELA NODDER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	A fair amount of the development is a distance away from the town centre not within reasonable walking distance, which will increase car use.  The use of greenfield sites should a last resort after all possible brownfield sites have been used. Then greenfield areas are our children's heritage and should not be destroyed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10997
<b>Person ID</b>	1268904
<b>Full Name</b>	NICOLA MAGUIRE & MARK BONAR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	* <b>Tring and Northchurch</b> will be completely overwhelmed - Tring (old small market town) with a housing quota which would increase it's population by more than half - 55% and Northchurch a village, which in the plan is being referred to as West Berkhamsted. Tring and Northchurch will be changes beyond recognition at a cost of losing their present and historical identities as small rural communities
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10998
<b>Person ID</b>	1268906
<b>Full Name</b>	RASHMA BYRNE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please accept this email as official notification of my objection to the building of thousands of homes on green belt land at the top of Swing Gate Lane.</p> <p>As a local resident for over 20 years I have acutely felt the pressure on school places, parking, doctors and dentist appointments and even travel into London at peak times. The infrastructure simply cannot support the number of new residents the planned housing would attract.</p> <p>Please give consideration to the needs of existing residents and nature and wildlife.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11031
<b>Person ID</b>	1268910
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON LAWSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I live in Berkhamsted and am concerned that the Plan takes no account of the town's geography, including its valley setting. Most of the new building proposed will be in Greenbelt land above the valley. There are no significant proposals to upgrade roads and traffic flow, or to improve cycle routes and public transport. In consequence, the new residents

are likely to drive into town in their cars, leading to increased pollution, which will naturally collect in the valley. This situation will have adverse implications for public health and for the Council's ability to meet Climate Change and air quality targets.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11084

**Person ID** 1162859

**Full Name** Lesley Brown

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I call for fewer houses to be built on green belt land and for the Local Plan to have the climate emergency fully integrated into its targets and objectives.

- the growth proposed for Berkhamsted is far too much. The plan proposes an increase of around 24% in the number of dwellings most of which are located within land designated as Green Belt. This sort of expansion unacceptable where “historic character and setting” of a market town like Berkhamsted needs maintaining and it would destroy valuable green belt habitat and amenity. A point that was recently made by government ministers.
- The population increase will overwhelm the current infrastructure, much of which cannot be altered or improved to accommodate the increase. Hospital facilities are already inadequate for the area, being some of the worst provision in the country, and even the proposed changes will not cope with the expected increase from this and other areas of development. Care Home and other care services just cannot cope with current numbers let alone the proposed increases. The same applies to dental, elderly and childcare which are all inadequate for the current population let alone the massive increased proposed numbers.
- The transport infrastructure and facilities in Berkhamsted are inadequate and over stretched. HCC have already concluded that there is NO scope for improving traffic flow in the town and particularly the High Street. The increased traffic will increase emissions and produce further pollution. The congestion will inevitably result in the creation of more “rat runs” in the town where traffic seeks to avoid delays thus further endangering pedestrians, children, cyclists etc. Berkhamsted is a valley town with the majority of residents living “on the hills” and public transport does not fully service those areas. Hence residents, many of whom are classed as elderly, have to rely on their

- cars for getting around. Why not consider building underground car parks. Why not go one step further and look to converting unused office space in to residential usage particularly with social/affordable housing requirements.
- The proposed developments mean more traffic. Car growth in the town is inevitable as public transport is inadequate. The hilly nature of the town means that it is not easy to get around on foot or bike. The car is the only option for the majority of residents, particularly for the older generation. The schools proposed will also result in extra traffic at peak times. Again, an increase in emissions as it will be many years before any changes in car propulsion comes into effect. All detrimental to the town and the environment. The building of so many houses in itself is environmentally unfriendly. Water and sewage management is a major issue. Our local chalk stream, the Bulbourne, is one of unique few, which are sadly disappearing, and is at risk. The water supply to the town is already nearing capacity with the limits on aquifer extraction. There is likely to be insufficient supply for the large developments without damaging the chalk stream.

It would appear from reading the document that the 2013 Core Strategy has been ignored as it states, that developments of this nature on Green Belt land will not happen. This conflicts with Ministerial Statements in December 2020 regarding the release and use of Green Belt land. Why promote the development and hence removal of Green Belt Land which cannot take into account the landscape and scenic views in the area? The area is used by walkers and ramblers so removal of this amenity will likely result in more travel as residents seek recreation in the countryside. The immediate and wider countryside close to and surrounding Berkhamsted has become more important and of greater value to residents particularly resulting from the current Covid-19 pandemic. There is every reason to believe this will continue even after the virus is contained or even beaten. This access to green spaces is essential for better mental health of the wider population.

Each town or village within the Dacorum Borough Council remit should still be able to have it's own individuality and importance. What is within the current proposal will take this away by making Dacorum a town rather than a Borough as there will be no border identification ie Leverstock Green will more or less merge with St Albans, Potten End with Hemel Hempstead & Berkhamsted and the same with Bourne End with both Hemel & Berkhamsted to name but a few.

It is important to remember that Green Belt land should, and can only be changed with the support of the local people – In my view YOU do not have this support from the local people of Berkhamsted. The Borough has only sort views via electronic means. No public forums, and a very inconsistent distribution of the Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation document. I am aware that many households in Berkhamsted and surrounding villages did not receive this document. For households without internet facilities the opportunity to meaningfully reply to the consultation was not available.

I DO NOT SUPPORT this plan Proposal

Please think again - do not take our Green Belt Land and overstretch still further our services, health and care provision.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11121

**Person ID** 1268953

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>2 My response to the draft Plan itself, as a Berkhamsted resident, is along the lines of those of the Berkhamsted Citizens Association and the Town Council, which are detailed and allied to that of CPRE Herts branch. The proposed number of houses in Berkhamsted should be significantly lower, with a target to reflect <i>need</i> rather than developer and Government <i>demand</i>. In addition the <i>need</i> identified should be that for affordable housing; and up-to-date figures used.</p> <p>3 The numbers identified in the draft Plan would need Green Belt release, which itself should only happen if there is no other identified Brownfield sites for this. Dacorum has a large proportion of Green Belt, AONB and SSSI land, making open land at a premium in its non-urban spaces; and Conservation Areas in the urban setting. Green Belt is not so much about being 'green' as about guarding against the coalescence of settlements. Thus any proposal which threatens this concept should be resisted; as should challenges to the historic built environment.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11137
<b>Person ID</b>	1268956
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Bell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Other important points that should be addressed in the revised Local Plan are:</p> <p>The proposed level of development in Dacorum, along with potential development in neighbouring St Albans City and District, Three Rivers District and in Buckinghamshire east of Aylesbury, would place an unacceptable burden on all types of infrastructure services and facilities in Dacorum. The plan as proposed does little to address the improvements in infrastructure required to support the proposed increase in housing.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport study must take into account of Berkhamsted’s geography and valley setting.</li> </ul> <p>Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant proposals should be made for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable</li> <li>Proposals must be made to improve walking/cycling/public transport</li> <li>Significant improvements should be described for public open spaces (apart from garden- sized suggestions )</li> <li>The ‘wildlife corridors’ must be more than a narrow strip along the A41, and must connect with meaningful habitats (e.g. tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat )</li> <li>Additional health services must be provisioned. The new surgery at Gossoms End is will not be able to cope with ALL the new developments. At present, only a minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11139
<b>Person ID</b>	1268956
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Bell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a town situated in a valley, air pollution is a significant issue which must be taken into consideration in a revised Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so</li> <li>• Berkhamsted lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the Air pollution naturally collects in this area.</li> <li>• The current Local Plan uses an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11173
<b>Person ID</b>	1262170
<b>Full Name</b>	Julie Banks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Berkhamstead and Tring</b> , I am shocked at the outline proposals to morph this beautiful, historic towns into urban sprawl. The lost green belt will for ever change these areas of OSNB – how can the council go against government guidelines to protect out green belt and still come up with this outline plan?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11180
<b>Person ID</b>	1264551
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Somervail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There is no delivery strategy for Northchurch. There is only a strategy for Berkhamsted. The strategy for Berkhamsted will absorb the rural village of Northchurch into a vast urban sprawl.</p> <p>The developments south of Shootersway and between Bell Lane &amp; Darrs Lane do not meet the stated goal of ensuring that the developments are close to the town centre and railway station (para 23.121). They are 4-5km away.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11191
<b>Person ID</b>	1268980
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian and Pamela Gamble
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Regarding the road infrastructure in Berkhamsted we would comment as follows: Unsuitable roads for the development area:</p> <p>Shootersway, Kingshill Way and Road were never designed for the amount of traffic they are now asked to cope with, and all are unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles. I walked along a stretch of Shootersway four times a day for over 25 years. As a pedestrian, these roads are very dangerous with the footpath in places being very narrow and unsuitable for wheelchairs and child buggies. Quite regularly motorists park on the pavement which makes them impossible to pass without stepping out onto an already very busy road, where you risk life and limb. Another very dangerous area for the pedestrian is navigating the small roundabout at the top of Cross Oak Road with its blind bend. The new builds in Tring and the proposed and recent developments along Shootersway will make this road very busy and even more dangerous.</p>



Shootersway, Kingshill Way and Road were never designed for the amount of traffic they are now asked to cope with, and all are unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles. I walked along a stretch of Shootersway four times a day for over 25 years. As a pedestrian, these roads are very dangerous with the footpath in places being very narrow and unsuitable for wheelchairs and child buggies. Quite regularly motorists park on the pavement which makes them impossible to pass without stepping out onto an already very busy road, where you risk life and limb. Another very dangerous area for the pedestrian is navigating the small roundabout at the top of Cross Oak Road with its blind bend. The new builds in Tring and the proposed and recent developments along Shootersway will make this road very busy and even more dangerous.

Shootersway is very susceptible to lying surface water and throughout much of the recent winter, large puddles lay at the side of the road. In one area on a bend, water has covered much of one carriageway for weeks at a time and on occasions the water also covers the footpath and grass verge. This makes the footpath impassable by pedestrians wearing ordinary shoes. Kingshill Road suffers particularly badly during wet weather with a continuous stream of water heading downhill towards the town. Most motorists are courteous to pedestrians, but on some occasions, because the narrow road does not allow manoeuvrability when large vehicles are coming in the opposite direction, the pedestrians end up getting soaked because the vehicles cannot avoid the water.

My wife and I have lived on (address removed), Berkhamsted for thirty years. Over the last ten or so years it has become increasingly difficult to navigate the road to and from town. Cars are parked on either side of most roads making the streets like rat-runs. People are now also parking in the streets around Berkhamsted and then walking to the station to catch trains and this has become an added problem. In the last 30 years the population of the area has grown enormously and this makes everyday living more difficult and your new proposals will only add to this.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11220

**Person ID** 1144644

**Full Name** Mr John Kerr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We are writing as residents of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.

The proposal to build 240 houses on Haslam fields and the BFI site would place much greater traffic demands on Kings Road and specifically on the junction between Kingshill Way, Shootersway and Kings Road. The junction is already unsafe because of the lack of a separate filter lane for traffic turning right at the top of Kings Road. Further, there is no scope to enlarge Kings Road to cope with a major increase in traffic: the footpaths in this part of Kings Road for pedestrians are already inadequate (or non-existent). The issues here include safety for pedestrians and drivers which would be considerably reduced by the resulting increase in traffic at this junction and along Kings Road; the pollution caused by the increased traffic – already at a standstill at many points in the day; the attractiveness of the town centre which would be reduced by the sheer difficulty in accessing it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11221

**Person ID** 1144710

**Full Name** Mrs Isabella Kerr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We are writing as residents of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.

The proposal to build 240 houses on Haslam fields and the BFI site would place much greater traffic demands on Kings Road and specifically on the junction between Kingshill Way, Shootersway and Kings Road. The junction is already unsafe because of the lack of a separate filter lane for traffic turning right at the top of Kings Road. Further, there is no scope to enlarge Kings Road to cope with a major increase in traffic: the footpaths in this part of Kings Road for pedestrians are already inadequate (or non-existent). The issues here include safety for pedestrians and drivers which would be considerably reduced by the resulting increase in traffic at this junction and along Kings Road; the pollution caused by the increased traffic – already at a standstill at many points in the day; the attractiveness of the town centre which would be reduced by the sheer difficulty in accessing it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS11271
<b>Person ID</b>	221884
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eliza Hermann
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I disagree with the Delivery Strategy for Berkhamsted because it is flawed and unachievable.</p> <p>Para. 23.102 correctly acknowledges the current deficiencies and constraints in the town including insufficient open space, highways, schooling provision and services. Para. 23.102 fails to mention existing flooding problems in the town centre, including at the railway station, and traffic congestion resulting in air pollution including in the Northchurch AQMA area.</p> <p>Para. 23.119 correctly acknowledges the congestion in Berkhamsted, including constrained roads, difficulties with bus movements, and limited cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed Delivery Strategy fails to address these issues, instead asserting at para. 23.121 that new development at the edges of the town will somehow "focus on ensuring they are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station, and public and sustainable transport options are enhanced." This amounts to waving a magic wand to change the topography of Berkhamsted and the existing constraints of the built up town centre.</p> <p>In addition, Berkhamsted is surrounded by the Chilterns AONB and the Green Belt both of which fulfill an important environmental role and are recognised in the NPPF as valid constraints in Plan making.</p> <p>The proposed Delivery Strategy fails to mention the Chilterns Conservation Board's proposal to expand the AONB to include the area directly to the south of Berkhamsted because of its high quality landscape.</p>

The level of growth proposed for Berkhamsted is vastly overstated and reliant on the removal of 93 hectares of land from the Green Belt. Providing "at least 2236" new dwellings between now and 2038 equates to a 24% increase in the number of dwellings in the town, and a 31% increase in the built-up area. Most of this increase is proposed for unsustainable locations far from public transport, infrastructure or facilities and services. This level of growth will make all of the existing deficiencies and constraints even more pronounced, will forever change the character of this historic market town, and will severely impact the quality of life of current residents because of the overcrowding of roads due to increased car traffic given the specific locations proposed for development. In addition this level of growth is unjustified given it is based on housing need calculations stemming from a flawed algorithm and out-dated data.

Housing delivery in Berkhamsted (Policy SP20) should be limited to 'windfall' provision plus site BK10 Hanbury's because it has already been allocated in the adopted 2013 Core Strategy, and sites BK11, BK12 and BK13 at Billet Lane and at the Civic Centre, because these sites are all 'brownfield' previously developed land. Policies SP21 and SP22 should therefore be deleted.

Because of the acknowledged insufficient open space within Berkhamsted, sites BK11, BK12 and BK13 all need to include significant amounts of public open space in their redevelopment designs. Further, the Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy needs to ensure that none of the existing, limited open space that does exist in the town is lost to any future development. (This includes not allowing the Berkhamsted town-centre Broadwater sports facilities to be redeveloped for other uses).

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11307
<b>Person ID</b>	1268999
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Birkett Birkett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to add my opposition to the above proposed plans to develop housing in the local area and especially in the fields at the top of Swing Gate Lane and across the fields from Thomas Corum School to Bourne End in particular.</p> <p>Our town has been blighted by so many similar projects these past years and has continued to spoil and destroy our beautiful green belt area.</p> <p>I really can't see that another large housing development is needed here or in any of the other surrounding areas at this time, and they will certainly not be affordable homes that even local residents will be able to upgrade to, or be of any quality that others may want to downgrade to.</p> <p>Furthermore, general exercise and keeping fit walks, especially during lockdown has made us appreciate where we live much more, and losing places like this will have a devastating effect on the environment, especially the space we need for our exercise and relaxation, our health in general, and even more so on the greenbelt wildlife flora and fauna.</p> <p>More housing here will obviously bring more cars too, which will mean they will have to drive to town and bring extra traffic fumes and congestion to our already full and busy town.</p> <p>Do we want greenery, trees, fascinating wildlife, clear open space and fresh air, or concrete, light pollution, fume pollution, noise pollution, more anti-social behaviour and crime....? I know which I prefer...!</p> <p>I implore you to please consider this before making your decision and slowly destroy the town we love.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11312
<b>Person ID</b>	1269000
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Tracey Franklin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As the Berkhamsted proposed developments are mainly at the edge of town, they will require residents to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport. This will increase carbon emissions and also greatly congest the already over used roads into the town centre.</p>

These proposals are for family homes. As the schools, dentists and doctors are massively oversubscribed, the majority of children will need to travel further afield to meet their educational or medical needs. It is also not practical or realistic to expect children to walk to schools etc from these edge of town developments and again, will mean an increase in use of private vehicles and AGAIN an increase in the carbon emissions of the town.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11360

**Person ID** 1269012

**Full Name** Julie Laws

**Organisation Details** Chair of Governors  
Ashlyns School

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

In light of the proposed 2236 new homes, we welcome the proposal for additional school places. (As stated in the Local Plan, Ashlyns school is full at 8 Forms of Entry.) However, we question the validity of an additional 6 FE secondary school to accommodate children for this age range given the number of homes. If we assume approximately 1 FE per thousand homes, it is unclear where the additional children will come from. Should the proposal be to reduce the forms of entry at Ashlyns to accommodate a new 6Fe school (anything less than 6Fe is not a financially viable option for a senior School) this would have a significant impact on Ashlyns and the proposed additional school; as well as the implications for economic viability, this would also affect the curriculum offer in both schools. In any case, should the proposed number of houses lead to only two FE, these, along with the 8 FE at Ashlyns, would only equate to 10 FE being required across the town following completion of the proposed housing development.

Given the implications, the Governing Board would like to be included in the discussions regarding education provision in the town.

South Berkhamsted, Shootersway developments, including Durrants Lane

These developments, which constitute the majority of the proposed new houses, will have a significant impact on Ashlyns school with the increased traffic and congestion. The town is in a valley and inevitably home owners will be using their cars. We have read through the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable transport plan provisions and welcome the increased

provision of crossing places, pavement improvements and cycle paths. We would also like to see the speed limit from the roundabout (Chesham Road, A41, A416) to Ashlyns School (currently National Speed Limit i.e. 60mph) given consideration for reduction. Our aim as a school is to provide a good quality education and for our pupils to be able to get to and from school safely. We request to be involved in discussion of all means of access to the School generally and in particular the development/provision of safe walking routes to school via HCC modeshift (safer routes to school).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11449

**Person ID** 1264362

**Full Name** Juliet Miller

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also

rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11472
<b>Person ID</b>	1269109
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE JAMES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing this as a resident and ratepayer of Northchurch and wish to raise some objections and concerns regarding the proposed new Local Plan
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11474
<b>Person ID</b>	1269109
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE JAMES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><u>Objections:</u></b></p> <p>Northchurch is a small rural village, the proposed Plan almost doubles the population without any infrastructure enhancements, (other than a school with access off a narrow single track lane with no pavements and bounded by ancient hedgerows). With no justification for housing at this level and no supporting infrastructure means the Plan is totally unacceptable.</p> <p><b>Green Belt loss</b> – excessive and unjustified. Why take areas out of the green belt in readiness for housing needs that may not materialise. If house building to Government target is forced through, then the excess over local need will only attract new people in the area, (new people probably working out of the area) and so makes the situation become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Our cost in loss of green belt, and a saving to other Council areas in that their house demands reduce.</p> <p><b>Once our Green Belt is lost it cannot be replaced.</b></p> <p><b>Road Infrastructure</b> – the authors of the documents have clearly not visited Northchurch to see the size, nature and state of the roads, and what are the local road improvements required even before new housing needs can be discussed for Northchurch and Berkhamsted.</p> <p><b>The topography of both Northchurch and Berkhamsted</b> limits the use of walking and cycling. The new sites are at the top of the valley with no bus routes current or planned and those that do exist being a good walk away from the new building sites. Not conducive to carrying your shopping home from the supermarket. Isolation at these sites will be a further result.</p> <p><b>Lock Field</b> – why does this site, already rejected several times and with significant safety issues and loss of wildlife habitat, reappear in this plan. <b>Wildlife habitat once destroyed cannot be just moved and created elsewhere.</b> Significant road safety issues for a local primary school, pedestrians, cyclists and cars will be created if this site is developed.</p> <p><b>Shootersway:</b> How can DBC claim to be protecting the environment and enhancing biodiversity, when in the last two Local Plans Shootersway has been a valuable green corridor protecting the area’s biodiversity, wildlife, trees and ancient hedgerows, but now all this can just simply be cast aside to provide unnecessary new housing.</p> <p>There is no clear assurance of any <b>infrastructure improvements</b> eg Health Services, open /green spaces with play facilities will be provided – existing capacity is insufficient to support the existing community. Improvements required before new homes and demand increases further.</p>

**Transport** – no infrastructure or road improvements are outlined for Berkhamsted or Northchurch, just minor junction changes to improve pedestrian / cyclist safety. Before the pandemic local roads around the town were frequently congested; with further housing proposed the traffic congestion will only get worse unless meaningful road improvements (and parking) are planned for. A full traffic survey will need to be completed when life is back to a little more like normal, with a review of transport needs.

The level of **homes forecast** seems totally unjustified when compared with the historic homes demand for the area. I await with interest the results of this consultation and seeing the objections and concerns raised being taken into consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11477

**Person ID**

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Infrastructure**

The transport study takes *no* account of Berkhamsted’s geography and valley setting. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.

No significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.

No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes.

No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)

The ‘wildlife corridors’ are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don’t connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)

No additional significant health services – new surgery at Gossoms End and only a minor extension of Manor Street Surgery, are supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11479
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Nearly all development proposed will be on Greenbelt. – this is against Government policy.</p> <p>The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. A green buffer is needed. They should look at further Brownfield sites – as they are required to do.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would strongly argue that the proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11488
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites. The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing. The plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally,</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11528
<b>Person ID</b>	1269119
<b>Full Name</b>	JENNIFER BLOGG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The sites do not meet sustainability assessment requirements as set by Dacorum BC. The sites conflict with Dacorum's own plan policies.</p> <p>Bk07 – Lock Field – shown be delisted. It is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The infrastructure demands to absorb this population growth have been ignored.</p>

Site design proposals (SPD's) have not been drafted, so no details what proposed in depth for each site'

Have not considered that "Shootersway" be considered as one overall neighbourhood "community" development – not 7 separate, non-contiguous sites, where separate developer objectives would deliver sub optimal social outcomes.

That the plan to date has insufficiently covered the social isolation impacts of these sites, in particular sites Bk06 and Bk08, and how these sites can best be fully absorbed into the community. No real attempt, or acceptance of commitments, to finding supporting transport solutions for these new, dispersed sites has been forthcoming, e.g. bus services.

As presented the Draft Local Plan does not address for the existing population how their existing social assets and facilities will be maintained and not overwhelmed. How, as far as is practical, will existing quality of life standards be protected, maintained, and where shortfalls currently exist that they would be addressed.

will not seek to increase road capacity". (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer)

Attrition against car uses, by resisting road improvement and adding to congestion, makes life difficult for everyone. More congestion, traffic delays, parking problems will impact by default on all - pedestrians, cyclists, bus users, commercial road users et al.

The Draft Local Plan is likely to create a "Catch 22". Wasting resources by tinkering at edge and not addressing crux of the problems,

More car usage is unavoidable, if population / housing is to be expanded. Not expanding and remodelling road infrastructure are not an acceptable alternative. Dacorum's approach is not in accord with Hertfordshire's Transport Plan (LTP4).

Dacorum's Local Plan is not in keeping with its own attitudes in its Draft Site Sustainability Appraisals and its Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The latter saying for the Shootersway sites.

" Development of this site would likely result in an increase in traffic to and from the site at peak hours, which would have a limited impact upon the local road network. If larger scale growth is proposed in the south west of Berkhamsted, it is likely that this would give rise to further traffic issues along Shootersway, particularly at the junction with the A416/Kings Road and the A41 junction. " For Darr's Lane, wording is amplified:

"...Development is likely to have an impact on the local road network at peak periods, including along Shootersway and Kings Road/A416. Significant improvements would likely be required, including enhancements to Darr's Lane, Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted High Street, Shootersway, Kings Road and the A416. "

Similar remarks are included in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (App B) that some of the sites are relatively close to bus transport :

Haslems Field = “Site is a 15-20 minute walk from the frequent 500/501 service to Watford. The 502 and 532 bus service to Hemel Hempstead is a 10 minute walk and is infrequent in comparison to the 500/501 service. “

Darr’s Lane = “Site is within walking distance to the frequent 500 bus services to both Watford and Aylesbury. Site is also within walking distance to the less frequent bus service of 532 to Hemel Hempstead.

A site of this scale has the potential to provide new/enhanced public transport connections with the existing town and wider area. “

Sites might be 15-20 minutes walk to access the A4251 and main bus services. BUT Up-hill on way home tired, then time = ?? What about on cold winter days, dark morning and dark evenings??

Equally not easy for young mum with young family in tow during the daytime – particularly on bad weather days. What about infirm etc.

Now add to above, for Darr’s Lane, that for half of the 1.2Km walk to the A4251, the route is single-track, no street-lights, and no pathways.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11530

**Person ID** 1269119

**Full Name** JENNIFER BLOGG

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Bank Mill Lane has only a handful of cottages - several listed buildings - and already there are traffic issues with cars overflowing from the Old Mill pub. There have been several near collisions on a road that is only wide enough for one car to drive down - and really should be one way. How will this road and indeed the bridge to Bank Mill sustain more cars and people? I can safely predict there would be deaths if this were to be the case.

Investment funds are being allocated to Hemel Hempstead for transport and amenity requirements associated with expansion of the town. Equivalent financial and infrastructure support is not being given to Berkhamsted and Tring.

I think the number of proposed developments across Dacorum is excessive and question the formula used to calculate it....

I am also concerned about families with sick children or elderly and disabled people trying to get to the Gossom's Road surgery where there is already inadequate parking? Trying to see a doctor prior to the pandemic was a near impossibility - how will the town cope with a huge influx of people, when there are already many elderly people living here who will need access to their local GP? Are we to simply never get to see a doctor as there will not be enough GPs to care for that many people...

I am deeply concerned about the strong Countryside / Green Belt boundary Impact on valley sides and important dry valley location.

Also I am worried about the encroachment of the urban area along the valley bottom and adjoining open countryside. Also the distance to town centre services and facilities, employment, land and station.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11545

**Person ID** 1269121

**Full Name** ALAN AND BARBRA CONWAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** As ratepayers and members of the Berkhamsted Citizens Association we wish to record our whole hearted support for the statement opposing the Draft Local Plan 2020 and presented by the One Voice Alliance.

Our concerns arise from, but are not limited to, the proposals to build on areas of the Green Belt to such an extent that it will be regretted by generations to come.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11601

**Person ID** 1269148

**Full Name** SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Berkhamsted**

Berkhamsted is entirely surrounded by Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Landscape Conservation Area. Land to the south of Shootersway, Kingshill Way and land known as South Berkhamsted creates an open buffer to the A41 bypasses whilst land to both the west and east is open land either a flood plain or open fields.

The scale of development proposed is excessive, increasing the housing numbers by some 30%, resulting in loss of a significant area of open countryside severely affecting the character of the settlement. There are no proven exceptional circumstances to justify the loss of such a large amount of Green Belt land. Development is planned to virtually abut the A41 Bypass. Given the majority of development proposed is at the top of the ridge, this is at least some 2 miles from the town centre, station and community facilities in the valley floor. Therefore, this will clearly encourage increased road use as public transport is very limited up the valley sides and given the majority of the development is at the top of the ridge, this is not conducive to walking or cycling. The existing infrastructure cannot cope and given the constrained nature of the town, there is little scope for the amount of improvement needed to cope with such a sizeable increase in population. The additional water usage would be likely to have a detrimental impact on flows in the River Bulbourne, which is one of the Chilterns' internationally important chalk streams.

Development numbers should be considerably reduced and any new dwellings should be concentrated in the town centre by way of maximising the reuse of brownfield sites, unused shops and offices. There is no justification for the proposed amount nor the loss of Green Belt land which must be greatly scaled down.

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11650
<b>Person ID</b>	1269150
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Helena Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Transport Links</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a historic market town that lies in a valley and as such has limited access for residents to travel across and through town to the high street or to the train station. There are only 3 major routes into town (along the high street either from Tring or Hemel Hempstead, and from the A41 down Kings Road) significantly increasing the number of houses in this area and therefore the amount of traffic flowing through these already over burdened routes and the effects of this, has not been fully considered in this proposal.</p> <p>Currently in Berkhamsted, at school opening/closing times and at morning/evening commuting times, traffic already queues along Shootersway, Kingshill Way, Chesham Road and Kings Road. Any additional housing in this area will increase the amount of traffic at key times and cause additional problems. I do not believe the impact of the increased traffic and resulting traffic problems and its impact on local residents been considered. Increased traffic along these routes will also impact the health, through air pollution, of the many students that walks these routes to school each morning and afternoon.</p> <p>Also worth considering is the impact on the traffic in the town when the A41 is shut, due to an accident/police investigation for example. Currently when this happens Berkhamsted is in gridlock - this situation can only worsen with the proposed increased in housing and therefore increased traffic flowing into and through the towns of in Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>

The proposed housing will cause an increase in pollution, increased traffic congestion, traffic noise and traffic hazards for current residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11672

**Person ID** 1269212

**Full Name** PETER SCOTT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We welcome the commitment to genuinely affordable housing to be included in developments in Berkhamsted and Tring but believe affordable needs to be properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.

The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.

The plan must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.

To sustain an increase in population, improvements in infrastructure need to be implemented as houses are built. These are commuter towns and residents rely on transport to make journeys out of the town to travel to work. The present rail and road networks will not sustain such an increase in population.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS11689
<b>Person ID</b>	1269212
<b>Full Name</b>	PETER SCOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11690
<b>Person ID</b>	1269212
<b>Full Name</b>	PETER SCOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11696
<b>Person ID</b>	1146103
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Simon Toon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This point mentions the good transport links TO Berkhamsted but completely neglects the inadequacy of transport links INSIDE of Berkhamsted, which will be made worse by the proposed</li> <li>This point emphasises that key transport links run along the valley floor but again neglects to mention the quality of transport connections from the proposed sites to this key transport I think this is important because looking at a map, one can see various roads going from near the proposed sites to the High</li> </ul>

Street/Shootersway, however, in reality few of these roads are adequate for the existing level of traffic, leave alone for the volumes that the proposed sites would generate. I therefore believe the plan is based on a false premise and should be revised taking into account the real local situation.

23.102 This section claims that growth will be transport/accessibility and infrastructure-led but the proposals do not adhere to this principle; I will give some very specific examples below.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11704

**Person ID** 1269219

**Full Name** CAROLINE SOUTO

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** First of all I would like to say that, as a Dacorum employee, I know how much hard work and effort my colleagues in Strategic Planning have put into the Local Plan, and I do not like to be in any way critical of this, however as a resident of Berkhamsted, I feel it is important to register my disagreement to the scale of the development proposed. I totally understand that more housing is required and that there is a need for good quality, affordable housing, but I am very uncomfortable with the loss of green belt land as proposed in the strategy.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11709

**Person ID** 1269219

**Full Name** CAROLINE SOUTO

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>To summarise my main objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The high level of development. This seems just too much. The targets handed down by central government should be challenged. I understand that the targets are from 2014 and suggest population growth that has now been refuted. Using more recent data from the ONS would suggest that much lower targets should be adopted which amount to half of the current targets.</li> <li>• Impact on green belt and loss of natural spaces. There would be huge loss of green belt land which I am not comfortable with. The strategy would destroy over 850 hectares of green belt which really does not align with the council's commitment to the Climate Change emergency. I strongly believe that we should not be developing on green belt land unless there is absolutely no other alternative.</li> <li>• Air pollution and the impact particularly on children walking to school. There are already air pollution concerns along the high street in Northchurch. The growth proposed would only make matters worse and would have a detrimental effect on children's health.</li> <li>• Increased traffic around Ashlyns School, Swing Gate Lane and Shootersway. These roads are already under pressure (gridlocked most mornings in rush hour) and such massive increases in housing numbers would make this so much worse.</li> <li>• Much of the developments are at the top of the valley by the A41 which will increase the flood risk and exacerbate drainage issues.</li> </ul> <p>As a very linear town, Berkhamsted is not suitable for such large scale development, much of which would be at the top of the valley. I would ask firstly that the housing targets are challenged, and secondly that all opportunities to develop on brownfield sites are fully explored before we agree to this level of loss of the borough's greenbelt.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my response. I would like to add that these are my own views, and that I have based my opinions solely on information that is in the public domain.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11735
<b>Person ID</b>	1269227
<b>Full Name</b>	EMLYN LAMBURN

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11754
<b>Person ID</b>	1264561
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Collins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded to the full consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>

In addition I wish to emphasise the following points:

- the data and approach underlying the draft plans projections for required housing growth are fundamentally flawed (and acknowledges to be so) and therefore their use as the basis for this plan is irrational;
- the proposals for housing development to the South and South East do not meet the stated plan objectives in that they will not be affordable for local people but will attract an additional population, primarily from London, who will not work in the Borough, but who will put unsustainable pressure on already over stretched local resources;
- none of the planned development to the South and South East of Berkhamsted will be compatible with sustainable transport - it is too far and too hilly for people to walk (or cycle) into town, shopping or schools. People will use cars - it is disingenuous to suggest otherwise;
- the infrastructure of Berkhamsted, including the road network in town and rail connections to London, cannot sustain such over-development. Berkhamsted is in a natural valley surrounded by green belt and national trust land and traffics funnels through the town centre;
- schools and GP services are over subscribed already - it is naive to believe undertakings from developers that they will make good this shortfall and the Council has shown itself incapable of enforcing requirements for such investment in the past;
- Berkhamsted has already over delivered additional housing against existing plans whereas other areas in the Borough have under delivered.
- the overall draft plan is fundamentally flawed and should it pass in its current form unlikely to survive judicial scrutiny.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11826
<b>Person ID</b>	350823
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sue Yeomans



<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Chilterns Countryside Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Delivery Strategies fail to meet the vision outlined. Release of substantial swathes of high quality Green Belt, much adjoining the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty cannot be mitigated. I fully endorse the response of the Chiltern Countryside Group to this question.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11867
<b>Person ID</b>	1269275
<b>Full Name</b>	KALLIOPI KOUTSOU
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	DBC should retain the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy as the revamped one fails to protect the historic character and setting of Berkhamsted by facilitating a 24% increase in dwellings and 31% increase in urban footprint through the release of Green Belt.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11875

<b>Person ID</b>	1269275
<b>Full Name</b>	KALLIOPI KOUTSOU
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p> <p>(24)</p> <p>This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11935
<b>Person ID</b>	1145687
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Polly Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The beautiful countryside surrounding Berkhamsted and Northchurch provides the foundations to some of the most important pillars of my life, that of my young family, and the community around us. Our mental health and physical wellbeing rely on the green open spaces that surround us, and many of our hobbies and pastimes are dedicated to the nature, the wildlife and the history living in it. Our eldest daughter is becoming an avid nature photographer – a hobby and potentially a career that she can pursue within yards of our home. Our youngest daughter a keen ‘treasure hunter’ – never appearing from a country walk without collections of animal skulls, bird eggs, remnants of owl pellets, deer antlers, fossils and ancient pottery... to name a few. She is already an aspiring archaeologist at the age of 8, a passion discovered and harnessed during long wanderings in the fields near our home. My husband and I lose ourselves in long country walks and runs through the surrounding countryside, the woodland and the hills, that are accessible by foot, and rely on these periods of escape in our local area more than any exotic holiday abroad. We are quite simply taken aback each day by the incredible views surrounding us, the frequent sightings of foxes, badgers, owls, mice, as well as a plethora of bird life – all within the fields and hedgerows neighbouring our house. The Bearroc Park development is already encroaching on this habitat, and whilst areas of brown belt in the local area remain unused and underdeveloped, we feel that it would be a scandal to build on protected greenbelt land, an area of outstanding natural beauty, with mass developments around Aylesbury and Hemel Hempstead threatening to swallow up Tring and Berkhamsted completely. Berkhamsted is regarded as a historic market town, a place of history and beautiful countryside, of close community. By continuing the cycle of ongoing development the rural feel to our beautiful town, the community way of life, the nature and our open spaces face permanent destruction.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">walker.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11943
<b>Person ID</b>	1150963
<b>Full Name</b>	SUE TAYLOR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<u>Urban Greenspace</u> Berkhamsted lacks the recommended quantity and quality of urban greenspace (as set out in your supporting information). This is to some extent compensated for by its linear nature and location within good countryside as people can walk out

of the town into countryside. The wooded roads and lanes on the edges of our town are valued by walkers, joggers and cyclists, if these are damaged the character of the town will be damaged and also the ability of the residents to access these informal greenspaces.

Northchurch a discrete settlement

I quote Page 32 Spatial Strategy for growth

*Providing growth in the villages that reflects their role and character; Minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB and other protected sites*

The proposals cannot achieve this given their scale, increasing the Northchurch population by at least 50% and within a sensitive location in the Greenbelt and highly visible from the Chilterns AONB

Northchurch has a history stretching back before Berkhamsted existed, which is why the ecclesiastical parish boundary shows Berkhamsted Parish within Northchurch/Sunnyside Parish. Residents of Northchurch (and Dudswell) are proud of their history and community. The name refers to the event when the Castle and St Peters were built creating a new town and leaving the Church

‘North’ of the Town.

We have our own shops, school, Churches, Parish Council, allotments, Sports and leisure facilities. There is much more of a community spirit in Northchurch than in Berkhamsted, I have lived in both.

The Local plan makes no mention of Northchurch as a separate entity regarding it as ‘West Berkhamsted’. The Local plan calls for building on the land between Durrants Lane and Darrs Lane and south of Shootersway. This will further erode our Village identity by directly connecting us along the greater part of our eastern boundary and by damaging or removing important landscape features that presently create visual and spatial separation between Berkhamsted and Northchurch.

Bell Lane and Woodcock Hill are important natural boundaries, visually, in terms of their biodiversity and for their historic value, Bell Lane being a sunken Lane typical of the Chilterns but unusual within our more urban landscapes.

It is important that Bell Lane and other similar ancient lanes in Berkhamsted are not erased in order to ‘improve’ traffic flow thereby losing the special character of our area.

Both Darrs and Bell Lane are single track for a significant length, Darrs lane is the one mostly used, it is unlikely to be able to cope with the major increase in traffic a school and housing on this field would generate.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11949

<b>Person ID</b>	1269350
<b>Full Name</b>	Jan Dent Safer Gravel Path Action Group
<b>Organisation Details</b>	SECRETARY Safer Gravel Path Action Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>General comments relating to Berkhamsted</b></p> <p>23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Topography is challenging and many occupants of new houses will drive, adding to existing congestion and parking issues. The town of Berkhamsted is already overwhelmed by traffic and under-provided with parking. Several businesses have already left the town for these reasons.</li> <li>2 There is no feasible way to deliver walking and cycling access to a town within a steep-sided valley with the housing at the top of the south side. At least not that will be used by the thousands of new residents, and their children. Given there is no provision for shops and other facilities on the south side of Berkhamsted, all these people will drive into the town.</li> <li>3 Lack of provision for schools, surgeries, hospital access, drainage, sewerage, etc</li> <li>4 Encroachment onto AONB and green belt</li> <li>5 Air quality will be adversely affected by increased traffic pollution</li> <li>6 There are no effective measures for achieving the fine words of the vision, indeed the effect of most of the Plan as set out will deliver the exact opposite.</li> <li>7 Estimates of housing requirements are based on out-of-date population data, which grossly overstate the numbers of population increase</li> <li>8 Points 2.24, and 2.25 are completely impossible to deliver and should be described as challenges</li> </ol>

- 9 The Plan claims that 2 primary schools and a secondary school will be built in Berkhamsted. It does not set out who will do this and how it will be funded.
- 0 What is a hierarchy of open spaces? Who will provide them and how will they be funded?
- 1 The plan needs to be recast in the light of the major shifts in working and living habits accelerated by the Covid crisis. Working from home will significantly reduce the need for office space. Employment Strategy 8.10 additional office space of 188,000 square meters will need to be revised down, avoiding the need to encroach on Green belt (8.18)
- 2 3b on Policy SP2, where will the “significant new investment in sustainable transport initiatives” come from? What are these initiatives? Just words on a page? Will there be any demand for them? People will just get into their cars.
- 3 Housing Delivery 7.20, is very weak, effectively indicates that there will be a lack of oversight of the development of infrastructure AHEAD of housing delivery.
- 4 Sustainable Transport and connectivity 21.3. Fine words coated in jargon. What exactly do you propose for “less car dominated future” in a town that lies at the foot of a steep-sided valley, i.e Berkhamsted?

### **Infrastructure & sustainability**

- The transport study takes *no* account of Berkhamsted’s geography and valley setting. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley. The residents of these houses will need to access the town and, owing to the steep hills involved, will by-and-large use their cars, exacerbating existing traffic congestion and parking problems.
- There are no significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion and pollution.
- There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted’s traffic situation, which is already excessive.
- Residents from the new housing needing to access the north side of the town and beyond will increase the flow over roads that are already blighted by volumes, speeding and pollution. Gravel Path and New Road suffer from choke points over the canal or under the railway or both, creating knock-on congestion back into the town.
- No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes. These are essential given the steep hills between the majority of the new housing and the town
- No significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)
- The ‘wildlife corridors’ are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don’t connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.
- The nearest hospitals are already operating beyond their capacities, and there is no provision for increasing their capacity to cope with the increased numbers of residents planned
- The Plan claims that 2 primary schools and a secondary school will be built in Berkhamsted. It does not set out who will do this and how it will be funded.

### **Water**

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It's not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested. Again, any planning actions based on this flawed plan will be highly vulnerable to judicial review.

### Green Belt

- Nearly all development proposed will be on Green Belt. – this is *against* Government policy.
- The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the “Green Lung” for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. *A green buffer is needed.* If this land is built upon, the already poor air quality on the south side of the town (and in the valley) will be considerably degraded beyond legal limits. There is no up-to-date consideration for this issue in the Plan
- DBC should look at further Brownfield sites – as it is required to do.

### Pollution

- Last but not least...Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Traffic already regularly breaks the 20-mph speed limit in Berkhamsted with impunity, creating pedestrian danger and damaging air quality for the many schools that lie on, or close to, the A4251 that runs through Berkhamsted and Northchurch
- Berkhamsted lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area. The proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.
- DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. *Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.*

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11959
<b>Person ID</b>	1269351
<b>Full Name</b>	STUART MACALISTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamstead I am writing to express that I am NOT in support of the local plan, with specific reference to the suggested growth around Berkhamstead. The plan is a simplistic sprawl of housing estates with no detail nor suggestions about how the towns infrastructure will cope or be upgraded.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed developments to the West and South of the town, (BK06 , BK08 in particular ) clearly exclude any new/ additional link to the A41, and this appears to be extremely problematic and will lead to excessive traffic on what are already over used, narrow residential roads.</p> <p>The planning department also do not appear to be exercising any decent of appropriate quality standards when it comes to current housing developments, to safeguard the character and quality of the town. Recent developments at Townsend Gate (in the east ) and the Taylor Wimpey developments off Shooter Way, are dumbed down, bog-standard, characterless and pastiche designs, cramming as many units onto the site as possible with a derisory amount of landscaping or quality of architectural design. I speak as a practicing architect.</p> <p>The lack of imagination, design quality and authenticity is undermining the architectural quality and heritage of the town - one of the key attractors for people to live and work here.</p> <p>By contrast, the alternative proposals by Thakeham, BSGCA, appear to be much better considered and with significant benefits over those in the council's draft local plan. This alternative plan would get my full support in principle, as it clearly acknowledges and proposed the appropriate level of infrastructure provision which must come with housing developments of this size. The council's own draft proposal has no positive upsides whatsoever.</p> <p>I would obviously like assurances that the proposed benefits from Thakeham must be delivered as part of that development and not be diluted or lost over time.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11975
<b>Person ID</b>	1269352
<b>Full Name</b>	Walid Youssef



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	DBC should retain the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy as the revamped one fails to protect the historic character and setting of Berkhamsted by facilitating a 24% increase in dwellings and 31% increase in urban footprint through the release of Green Belt.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11987
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted is a market town situated in a valley with steep sides. The railway, canal, river Bulbourne and A4251 all run parallel along the valley bottom. The steep sides of the valley discourage walking to the High Street. The traffic lights in the centre with the junction A416 to the railway station are already overused. The canal and river Bulbourne are amenities for the town. No culverts over the river Bulbourne should be permitted because they affect the eco system of the river water. Land at the side of the river and canal should be preserved for future generations to provide additional green recreational space which is sparse in the town.</p> <p>Shootersway in Berkhamsted is a narrow road unable to support the traffic that will be generated by 700 + houses that are proposed to be built along its 1mile route. There is only pavement on one side which is very narrow in some places so unsuitable for push chairs. The wing mirrors of some vans whip past ears and in wet weather pedestrians regularly</p>

get splashed by cars. From Durrants Lane to Kings Road there is one route to the High Street via Cross Oak Road which is single width in places and has no continuous footpath. Shooterway Lane is a private street unadopted by the council with access for residents only. The Draft Plan omits how the already congested roads in Berkhamsted will cope with the extra traffic generated by 700+ families. At present the queue from the traffic lights at the top of Kings Road at busy times can extend along Shootersway to Shootersway Park. The houses are proposed to be built on the periphery of the town over the top of the steep valley with no plans for cycle routes and footpaths. Daily car travel will be the preferred option resulting in increased car emissions and pollution. Walking and cycling chosen as leisure pursuits.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11997

**Person ID** 1269352

**Full Name** Walid Youssef

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12057

<b>Person ID</b>	1264202
<b>Full Name</b>	Philippa Wosiek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted and Northchurch are within a valley location with the A4251 running from east to west giving access to Hemel Hempstead and Tring. The road network off A4251 in Berkhamsted and Northchurch is heavily built up not allowing movement for roads to be widened or indeed for any improvement to pedestrian pavements and / or to provide cycle routes.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12058
<b>Person ID</b>	1264202
<b>Full Name</b>	Philippa Wosiek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Local Plan as is needs to be refreshed in light of the pandemic to move forwards with what has been learnt about how our environment is used.</p> <p>The NPPF gives guidance for 'beautiful, enduring and successful places.' Dacorum should put in place an observation and evaluation study for any site proposed but due to the last year's pandemic, I suspect what was carried out was a desktop exercise. A site visit particularly to the proposed areas in Northchurch, would show how land topography is hilly</p>

and undulating in nature; transport access using existing roads which in places are no more than single (one way) one car at a time.

Bell Lane is given as a traffic corridor for north - south movements - it is little more than a lane. Darrs Lane is an access road running parallel to Bell Lane - in places it is single one way traffic only plus has hedgerows and trees which would potentially be destroyed ruining the biodiversity in the area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12067

**Person ID** 1264913

**Full Name** ian Stephenson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- 1 Town Infrastructure The proposal seems to mention only two additional schools. One is a primary school that is located very close to an existing primary school to the east of the town and a secondary school to the west of the town.
- 2 2500 dwellings are proposed. Based on there being 1 school aged child per dwelling, there is therefore a need for space for 2500 pupils. Will this be enough in terms of provision of
- 3 What happens if sites that are required to provide schools are not
- 4 The provision of the primary school is in the area adjacent to Thomas Coram school. This is also a primary school. It is also relatively close to Swing Gate School which is also a primary school from my understanding.
- 5 There is no provision of a primary school in the in the south west part of town where a significant number of houses are proposed and where there are currently more houses being
- 6 There does not seem to be any allowance for doctor's surgeries. 2500 homes would generate around 6000

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12068

<b>Person ID</b>	1264913
<b>Full Name</b>	ian Stephenson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Traffic circulation There is no indication of any traffic impact study having been undertaken as part of the preparation of these documents nor does there seem to be any intention of a study being undertaken prior to these ideas being developed further.</li> <li>2 It is irresponsible of Dacorum Council not to undertake such a study given the significant increase in the proposed number of dwellings. They will have a massive impact on traffic circulation in the town and this must be</li> <li>3 Such a study should recognise that many of these proposed sites are at a significant distance from the town centre, train station, etc., and provide alternative means of</li> <li>4 As is acknowledged in the document, Berkhamsted is a 'valley' town that was originally a series of hamlets along what was the original London to Chester Road. Now the High Street. Until the arrival of the bypass (now the A41) it was the A41, a relatively important route to the north west from London and vice</li> <li>5 It was the increasing local demand of traffic movement within the town that was a factor that prompted the construction of the bypass.</li> <li>6 The High Street essentially runs east/west (actually closer to south east to north west if one is being pedantic!) along the line of the Bulbourne River. In the mid 19th century the Grand Union Canal and Railway line were added running parallel to</li> <li>7 So, the principal route through the town was and remains the High Street. Aside from the road to Chesham this dictated the layout of the roads that developed as the town grew. These were a series of roads that ran south from the High</li> <li>8 The 'ends' of these roads were 'connected' by roads such as Charles Street and Shootersway for example. None of these roads for a variety of reasons provide any alternative route that runs parallel to the High Street that assists in allowing traffic movement through the town that is remote from the High</li> <li>9 The area to the north of the railway line was only developed during the 20th The main route through that section of the town, Bridgewater Road. At the eastern end of Bridgewater Road, this indirectly feeds into the High Street.</li> <li>0 Hence the High Street is fundamentally important to the free movement of vehicular traffic within the It is also the primary route for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>1 The High Street is already congested in terms of vehicular traffic and any further development on the perimeter of the town will only aggravate the situation.</li> </ol>

- 2 One of the biggest challenges relating to that congestion has been the traffic lights at the intersection between the High Street and Kings Road. The geometry of the intersection prevents it ever being modified from the current sequencing without the demolition of buildings and the realignment of the road. To put it bluntly, with the new set of traffic lights, my understanding is that this is the best it will get!
- 3 Many of the new sites are in the order of a mile or more from the centre of town and will require the use of a car to access the town. We are talking about a 25% increase in the number of dwellings in the town, but the distance of the new dwellings from the centre of town will result in an increase of arguably 40 to 60% of local car
- 4 I was not able to find any reference to the use of the provision of cycle lanes, etc. to provide an alternate means of transport into and out of the town centre. This has to be addressed as part of the process.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12069

**Person ID** 1264913

**Full Name** ian Stephenson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- 1 Sites to the south of the town The bulk of the proposed sites are on land to the south of Berkhamsted.
- 2 Of those sites, all are either adjacent to the bypass (A41) or within 100 meters of the bypass. It is difficult to see that without some form of significant sound/pollution protection measures, residents will not be impacted by the noise and pollution from the bypass. Standing in Shootersway this morning, you are very aware of the noise.
- 3 The documents simply state this as being a problem without beginning to offer any solution to the problem.
- 4 Without the erection of massive barriers, what other options are there available? These barriers will all be on the southern side of the various sites and hence will shade any of the houses that are close to the southern spart of that site. This will be particularly bad in An option might be to have those parts of the site being designated public open space but looking at the size of the sites, many would not be viable.
- 5 Barriers also tend to look unsightly from a

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12070
<b>Person ID</b>	1264913
<b>Full Name</b>	ian Stephenson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 In terms of many of the sites to the south of the town, the only road access will be off During the lockdown that was a route that I walked along frequently. It was very clear that this is a busy road. It is also relatively narrow and does not seem to have a sensible speed limit applied to it.</li> <li>2 There are a number of minor roads that feed into Shootersway and have done for some There are others that have recently started to feed into the road with very recent developments to the south west of the town.</li> <li>3 The new sites will require further intersections at positions that will not be ideal in terms of both spacings to the next intersection and alignment with feeder roads on the other side of</li> <li>4 Some of the existing roads that feed into Shootersway at the western end such as Bell Lane, Durrants Lane are all single track roads that will simply not be able to cope with the additional demands that the new developments will</li> <li>5 As noted above, Shootersway roadway has a very narrow carriageway, with limited space on either side with vegetation very close to the roadway. The pavement is only on one side and currently there is no space at all for any form of cycle lane. Even with the current level of development this is a road that really demands a cycle</li> <li>6 Reviewing each of the specific proposals for all of the sites proposed, there will be a need to provide at least 6 and potentially as many as 9 additional access points onto Shootersway if all of the developments were to</li> <li>7 Many of these will be very close to access points on the other side of the</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12071
<b>Person ID</b>	1264913
<b>Full Name</b>	ian Stephenson

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Some of the bigger sites quite rightly require that areas of the site are to be provided for schools, parks, retail facilities, etc., and in the case of the first two, make a contribution to their cost of That is wholly appropriate.</li> <li>2 However, there does not seem to be requirement for those developing the smaller sites to make any form of contribution to the costs of new schools, parks, etc. That ought to be a requirement and needs to be included in the requirements for each of the sites.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12143
<b>Person ID</b>	1154438
<b>Full Name</b>	Natalie Crane
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as a formal response to consultation on the Dacorum Local Plan, particularly in relation to the proposals for Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I object to the current plan for the following reasons.</p> <p><b>Housing number and distribution</b></p>



- The scale of the proposals will see an increase of housing in the region of 24%. Research shows that this is far in excess of what is required as it is based on outdated housing projections from 2014 and not more recent ONS data from 2018, which indicates only half of the 900 + houses are actually required.
- Dacorum Borough Council (DBC), as a local elected body, should be challenging the housing numbers dictated by central Government on behalf of their communities, and not simply accepting figures that are not current or correct.
- While I appreciate that Hemel, Berkhamsted and Tring are all expected to take their 'fair share' of housing proposed. Each of these settlements have their own issues and constraints (topography-how hilly it is/valley, congestions, lack of public transport, lack of safe cycle ways, etc.). However, I don't believe that the draft plan takes these vital issues into account and instead simply looks at the numbers.
- I do not believe that the current plan would provide what is really required, namely affordable housing. Recent developments in Berkhamsted have proved this.

### Infrastructure

- The transport study takes *no* account of Berkhamsted's geography and valley Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.
- There are no significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.
- No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes.
- There are no significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)
- The proposed 'wildlife corridors' are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don't connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- No additional health services – new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments. A minor extension of Manor Street is proposed. This is insufficient to meet the needs of the plan.

### Water

- DBC is relying on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. It's not clear what impact the development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially with a greater number of housing suggested.

### Greenbelt

- Nearly all development proposed will be on Greenbelt. – this is *against* Government policy.
- The land between Shootersway and the A41 has always been considered as the "Green Lung" for Berkhamsted – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. *A green buffer is needed.*

- The plan needs to look further at Brownfield sites, as I believe is a Government requirement.

### Sustainability

- The sustainability sections are weak at best. Berkhamsted is seen as ‘sustainable’ because it has (some) good facilities, despite the many constraints (hilly, congested main route through valley floor). Most of the proposed building is at the top of the hill, where people will rely on their cars for travel in and out of town. There are no significant improvements proposed for Berkhamsted’s traffic situation, which is already an issue in the town.

### Pollution

- Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Our town lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area.
- I would strongly argue that the proposed – excessive – developments, will result in poorer air quality.
- DBC are using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. *Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.*

Health and well-being are paramount to our communities. This Local Plan, if anything, will make life worse for those already living here and offer a congested, polluted, market town, stretched beyond its limits, to anyone thinking of moving here.

### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12162
<b>Person ID</b>	1269444
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms Jim & Katie Barnard & Partridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	— Too much of the housing proposed is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12165
<b>Person ID</b>	1269444
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms Jim & Katie Barnard & Partridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	— [3.84 site 16] —Already Taylor Wimpey has two sites developing here between Coppins Close and Durrants Lane and traffic is noticeably greater along Shootersway; a quiet road is now busy and the congestion at key times of day from commuter traffic is already very marked. This is of further concern as the congestion impedes access for parents to Greenway school to drop off children in the morning. Other access roads to these sites are up/down steep hills, indeed Bell Lane and Darrs Lane are so narrow that they are suitable for single lane traffic only (bordered by ancient hedgerows). Walking or cycling into the town centre is not an option for most people most of the time because of the hills and the distance involved such that any further development here will further increase car usage. This is not only bad for the environment but will also alter the quiet rural characteristic of this part of Berkhamsted irrevocably.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12168
<b>Person ID</b>	1269444
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms Jim & Katie Barnard & Partridge

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Northchurch:</p> <p>— Northchurch is over one thousand years old and has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Northchurch has a distinct identity and people know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly and local people are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The proposed development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in a very significant increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements. There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition). It is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12186
<b>Person ID</b>	399285
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Roberts
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>These housing numbers in the Local Plan for Dacorum and therefore Berkhamsted are excessive and totally wrong.</p> <p>The impact on the infrastructure, increased pollution, increased congestion in Berkhamsted which is already gridlocked at peak traffic flow times and will therefore continue to give major road safety concerns.</p> <p>The local water supply to Berkhamsted is already on a knife edge with the existing number of dwellings - so how are you going to supply all this additional water for another 2,000 plus houses in Berkhamsted??</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12187
<b>Person ID</b>	399285
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Roberts
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I disagree with these proposals for the Local Plan and the housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>To build even more houses in Berkhamsted and especially along Shootersway and Kingshill Way will be disastrous!</p> <p>No consideration appears to taken into account with these housing densities on the existitng road structure and feeder roads (perhaps commonly referred to as "rat runs").</p> <p>The impact on the ecology and environment of Berkhamsted in general is not acceptable.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12217
<b>Person ID</b>	1269472
<b>Full Name</b>	MARGARET RITCHIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>DETAILED COMMENTS ON BERKHAMSTED</p> <p>Whilst accepting that a level of additional housing is inevitable, for the following detailed reasons, the house numbers allocated to specific sites in Berkhamsted are completely at odds with the town's ability to provide adequate infrastructure. To allow the original process to be driven towards locations, only identified by the "call for sites" process was bad enough. For the second Consultation to ignore the comments made in the first process, about the unsuitability of many of these sites, is even worse.</p> <p>Surely the whole point about a Local Plan is to coordinate all the available and suitable sites with the current or future possible infrastructure available to support considerable increases in population - none of this has been done to a satisfactory level, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 House location - the current proposal for Berkhamsted has over 90% of the total proposed numbers along the South East edge of the town, with almost 900 houses off or using one single route - Shootersway/Kingshill Way, atop the hill, on one side of the Berkhamsted valley. There is no proposal or even attempt to increase road access from these locations to the town, schools or other activities.</li> <li>2 Regarding Road structure, including junctions and car parks: the published Transport Plan seems to be a contracted-out desk top survey, which does nothing to suggest how any huge number increase could work. It recognises the topography of the town and the valley nature; also the existing narrow streets, due to the many centuries of civic life here - it offers NOTHING, as a suggestion of how changes could be made to accommodate the proposed number of additional houses, population and cars.</li> <li>3 Transport system - there is no suggestion that any additional public transport would provide a useable method of transporting new residents to town, schools or leisure facilities, meaning an inevitable increase in private car traffic</li> </ol>

- 4 School places - a number of new primary schools and an additional secondary school would be needed but the evidence of committed provision by the County Council is not in evidence. The proposed site for a secondary school in Darrs Lane is at the opposite end of town from the major developments and would involve children walking on un-paved roads, on single track roads and steep hills.
- 5 Sports facilities - the town is already underprovided with sports and leisure facilities and the proposal actually uses one significant site for a further 150 houses. The ability of the authority to compel the completion of space and leisure services, already planned has been poor, as the Bearroc Park developments show. The option to link a single major housing site with new sports facilities and two schools, as proposed in the Bulbourne Cross development was not taken forward - this is disappointing.
- 6 Medical services - the town has only two group practices, just coping with the current population. No discussion has taken place with the CCG on how additional planned numbers could adequately be dealt with. The total absence of any acute hospital facility, west of Watford has not been addressed
- 7 Local Employment opportunities - very limited currently and no new ideas discussed
- 8 Shops and services - The capacity of the existing town centre shops is not infinite - just two supermarkets and one "metro". There is no option for any new out-of-town facility and the new planned store, at Gossoms End, by Lidl and mentioned in the reports, has been owned with planning permission for over four years. The company has no current plans to complete this development. The capacity of the existing food shops has been evident during the Covid times, when queuing has been enforced; how would 2000 more families fit in?

In conclusion, may I say that the whole principle of the Local Plan has not been achieved and has merely provided a ready canvas for developers and landowners to set out their stall. Without the possibility to provide adequate and timely infrastructure to cope with the numbers, we should move to more suitable locations within the Borough where infrastructure already exists and/or can be more easily expanded. DBC must also succeed in persuading Central Government that the currently discussed numbers - now over 1000 new homes per year - are impossible to accommodate within the existing town structure and would go against their own declared Green Belt protection policies.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12219

**Person ID** 1249858

**Full Name** Mrs Jillian Luff

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>OBJECTION SPECIFIC TO MY LOCALITY – NORTHCHURCH</p> <p>AIR POLLUTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already poor in valley bottom. Air pollution will only increase</li> <li>• Not an island. Link route between Hemel (10,000+), Tring (2,000+), Berkhamsted (2,000 +) plus developments in Aylesbury and Chesham</li> <li>• Increased housing within Northchurch will inevitably add to the pollution along the High Street</li> </ul> <p>CHARACTER WILL BE RADICALLY ALTERED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation lumps Northchurch in as West Berkhamsted. This locality is not urban in character but a low density built-up area with a ragged edge of multiple green areas, several of which will be lost</li> </ul> <p>GREEN OPEN SPACE MUST BE PRESERVED TO MAXIMISE ACCESS AND TRANQUILITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now recognised as crucial to physical and mental wellbeing</li> <li>• We have witnessed the extreme wear and tear on our immediate ‘green’ surroundings during lockdown. With the number of dwellings proposed and the reduction of precious open green space in this locality this will only get worse.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12231
<b>Person ID</b>	1269477
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH ASHLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	



\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am 19 years old and have lived in Berkhamsted almost all of my life. I love my town so am extremely disappointed by the proposed development laid out in the draft local plan. Not only is it clear that the opinions of local people have not been taken into account, but it seems evident that there has been no thought of how the new developments will affect young people and the future of Berkhamsted.

Firstly, the destruction and development of large areas of greenbelt land is completely unacceptable. Not only will this have devastating impacts on biodiversity and local wildlife it also seems completely unnecessary. Where in the past the council have said that greenbelt areas are highly sensitive to development and their boundaries "should be adjusted only in exceptional circumstances... with the support of local people." (letter from the Department of Communities and Local Government, June 2016) now that seems to have been forgotten in favour of property development companies rather than local people and the local environment. On top of this, building over greenbelt land will negatively affect the mental health of many Berkhamsted citizens. During the past year green spaces have become a much bigger part in everyone's lives. I know for myself and my peers after the cancellations of exams we were left feeling useless, being so close to beautiful countryside was necessary in maintaining a sense of normality and sanity that we most definitely could not have gone without. In the current mental health crisis our country is facing, it feels irresponsible of the council to even think about removing so much green space from the local community. Instead, it seems obvious to build instead on brownfield land or through conversions of already urban areas – instead of taking away our beloved countryside!

I plan on living in Berkhamsted long into the future, that's why I am so disappointed in the lack of affordable housing that the draft plan is proposing. Berkhamsted is known to be a bustling family town with people of all ages. Unaffordable housing will force out young people, changing the town's dynamic and culture. I also worry about the affect that the increased population size will have on local infrastructure. My last year at Ashlyns school I saw first hand the strain on our local schools, although I see new schools have been proposed it does not seem enough.

The draft local plan is also incredibly vague when it comes to discussing how Dacorum council will work with developers and stakeholders to ensure that Hertfordshire's carbon emission and climate targets are met. Local people should not have to suffer environmental degradation to their local town because of development that was unwanted in the first place!

Overall, as a young person who has grown up in Berkhamsted and plans to stay in the town long into the future I am extremely disappointed by the Draft Local plan, it lacks an awareness of the needs of local people and if it were to go ahead the environmental damage it would cause would be completely unforgivable. I hope my voice, and the opinions of other local people will be listened to and plans will be rewritten to meet the needs of the town and its citizens.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12232

**Person ID** 1149618

**Full Name** Mr John Brabner

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 The Plan for Berkhamsted appears to ignore the linear nature of the town, and the challenges of access to the majority of the proposed sites up and down the valley slopes.</p> <p>1 In particular, little detail is provided on management of the issues arising from reliance on Kings Road, and the narrow and already overloaded routes of Swingate Lane, Chesham Road Darr's Lane, Kingshill Way and Shootersway.</p> <p>1 There is scant evidence of technical and cost considerations of service utilities in terms of resources and availability.</p> <p>1 School provision is considered inadequate and inappropriately placed, with a site at the top of Darr's lane being particularly poorly placed for both road access and population spread.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12328
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Regarding the plans to build houses in Shootersway bordering Darrs Lane and Bell Lane, Rossway, and in Lock Field Northchurch, any plans issued by DBC should put climate change, biodiversity, and the wellbeing of local people as the priorities.</p> <p>I walk with my family in Bell Lane and Darrs Lane, both of which are sunken ancient lanes. We adore and enhance our wellbeing with the beautiful and ancient hedgerows, and views, which have evolved over hundreds of years, wild bluebells, beautiful views and tranquillity. Why DBC would want to destroy this ancient countryside is utterly beyond us! Once DBC have destroyed it, it will be gone forever, and the character and feel of Northchurch will be gone. My grandchildren will have none of the enjoyment from these beautiful areas and lanes that my children have grown up with, and enjoyed walks with us, up Bell Lane, along Shootersway and down Darrs Lane, a lovely peaceful walk, but DBC want to take this from us.</p> <p>We have walked many times with other members of the Parish, up New Road, enjoying the Easter period, and all other times of the year</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12329
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The traffic coming down Darrs Lane is already unacceptable, and causing major erosion to the beautiful natural wildlife banks either side of the road. The Council have exacerbated this problem by allowing many new houses to be built in Shootersway already. Every year, work has to be carried out on the road to reinstate the tarmac which is worn away at the side due to increased traffic, and more rainfall due to climate change. Also, as a result of allowing Tesco to enlarge their store in Northchurch, this has added to a terribly ugly street scene at that site, with way too much traffic and totally inadequate parking. There never used to be cars parked up Darrs Lane, but that is what the Council have caused now, as a result of already building way too many homes. The sight of all these cars parking in what used to be a quiet residential area is an absolute outrage.</p>

There is also already a build up of traffic in Shootersway in the mornings as people go to school and work, and come home again.

Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and New Road simply physically cannot cope with more houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12331

**Person ID** 1269490

**Full Name** MIKE WHIT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Northchurch is not West Berkhamsted. Northchurch is an ancient small village, which existed in fact before Berkhamsted. Please stop referring to us as part of Berkhamsted.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12335

**Person ID** 1269490

**Full Name** MIKE WHIT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>DBC wish to have a totally unnecessary impact on Green belt, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Northchurch is in the Chilterns AONB which is designated as protected landscape of national importance. Dacorum has a legal duty to protect and enhance this, yet it wants to build houses on it!</p> <p>A load of houses in Northchurch will have a massive impact and intrusion, visually, with greater noise due to traffic and greater pollution.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12339
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>What seems important to the Council is the economy, and building large houses which offer absolutely no chance for local people, and this includes young people seeking their first homes to be close to their family in Northchurch. What DBC are interested in, is providing large executive houses for people coming out of London. It has no interest whatsoever in the needs of local people, who use this beautiful countryside, and who need homes they can afford. Also, homelessness in Dacorum is not going to be improved by building large houses!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12347
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	DBC proposals put so much pressure on roads, particularly all the roads down into Northchurch from Shootersway, which was never built for this and the original old A41, where there is already a major pollution problem. The ridiculous amount of new homes proposed, is going to push more and more cars through the valley through Northchurch, causing more pollution and traffic. The Council are already monitoring pollution in Northchurch with machinery to do so in the centre of the village. Why would the Council actively take steps to increase pollution even more, with an impact on the elderly in the village, and the many young people and families who walk to school in the area. The council seem to be prepared to sacrifice the health of the people who live here, with more traffic, more pollution, and the destruction of our beautiful countryside and lanes in which we walk.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12350
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The beautiful hedgerows in the area, and the fields, connect all of the families in Northchurch to the countryside, but the Council wants to stop all of that with these terrible housing plans  You are also threatening the wildlife and ecology of Hockeridge Woods, Rossway and the areas approaching Wigginton and in Tring also  DBC needs to have a big rethink of the plans. Northchurch is not an urban area, it is a village adjoining national trust land!

The Chiltern Development Board comment on how important it is for us all to retain our wellbeing and health through the enjoyment of local natural scenery, biodiversity and habitat. Once DBC have built houses all over these ancient beautiful areas, they will be gone forever, and DBC will be responsible for this.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12352

**Person ID** 1269489

**Full Name** STEVE HILL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12408

**Person ID** 1269499

**Full Name** Mrs Penny Kent

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My submission resisting proposals submitted in latest Dacorum Town Plan:</p> <p>I am sending this letter as I have very great concerns about the Dacorum Town Plan, for many reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I live in Dudswell and I cannot imagine the disruption and chaos caused to Northchurch if there was a development of 60 houses in Lock Field-which is at present precious greenbelt land. But it is not just the loss of greenbelt that worries me-there is a very narrow bridge over the canal on New Road and only one vehicle can proceed over this at any one time. The right of way is for cars going up the hill but often cars 'nip' in and cause road rage and near accidents. Cars are parked on the road above the canal bridge which cause further problems. But a huge safety issue is St Mary's Primary School which is on the right hand side below the canal bridge. This is a thriving School and many children walk there or are taken there in the mornings and collected mid-afternoon. There is a massive bottleneck at the moment without more cars being involved. The safety of schoolchildren is extremely important and with so much more traffic around the children's lives will be put at risk.</li> <li>I understand 200 houses will be built behind Granville Road and Chaucer Close, between Darrs Lane and Durrants Lane. With all the extra traffic on these roads I cannot imagine the bottlenecks, accidents and congestion that might ensue. The area at the bottom of Darrs Lane by Tesco in Northchurch is always blocked so what would happen with more cars. Durrants Lane has two schools which again is an important safety issue. I also understand that traffic might be encouraged to use Bell Lane-this is a single track road with ancient hedges so not advisable for extra traffic.</li> <li>I used to live in Tring and understand that there are so many houses planned that it will almost double the size of this delightful town. Where is the extra infrastructure with all the houses planned-Schools, doctors, shops.....?</li> </ul> <p>Instead of choosing Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring for these hundreds of houses I think Dacorum Borough Council should have a re-think. Hemel Hempstead has plenty of Schools, doctors and the town centre has shops which need people there.</p> <p>And I am not sure we need all these extra houses in our so-called 'commuter belt'. There are less trains and people are working at home so need not reside in these already highly populated areas.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12418
<b>Person ID</b>	1269503
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jan Wosiek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Paras 23.132</p> <p>There are references to 'West Berkhamsted', Since when has Northchurch been known as West Berkhamsted?</p> <p>A simple google of 'Northchurch' indicates a map outlining the area in which proposed developments BK06 and BK08 fall.</p> <p>Is this a not so subtle plan by DBC or the developer to rename our village?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12419
<b>Person ID</b>	1269503
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jan Wosiek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1: The majority of developments are proposed for Green Belt land, approximately 850 hectares over the whole of Dacorum. I believe Dacorum have failed to consider The National Planning Policy Framework, Para 11; Footnote 6.</p> <p>Once the green belt is gone, it cannot be recovered.</p> <p>2: Berkhamsted is a valley town with only the A4251 providing realistic access/egress.</p> <p>The massive development in Tring, will have a negative environmental impact in the form of road traffic increase / noise / pollution on Northchurch / Berkhamsted as Tring residents avail themselves of the facilities Berkhamsted has to offer.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12427
<b>Person ID</b>	1146040
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Macdonald
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Berkhamsted &amp; Tring Developments</b></p> <p>I welcome the commitment to genuinely affordable housing to be included in developments in Berkhamsted and Tring but believe affordable needs to be properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.</p> <p>The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.</p> <p>The plan must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.</p> <p>To sustain an increase in population, improvements in infrastructure need to be implemented as houses are built. These are commuter towns and residents rely on transport to make journeys out of the town to travel to work. The present rail and road networks will not sustain such an increase in population.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12442
<b>Person ID</b>	1146040
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Macdonald
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12444
<b>Person ID</b>	1146040
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Macdonald
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12483
<b>Person ID</b>	1269523
<b>Full Name</b>	RORY LUMSDON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The sites do not meet sustainability assessment requirements as set by Dacorum BC. The sites conflict with Dacorum's own plan policies.</p> <p>Bk07 – Lock Field – shown be delisted. It is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The infrastructure demands to absorb this population growth have been ignored.</p> <p>Site design proposals (SPD's) have not been drafted, so no details what proposed in depth for each site'</p> <p>Have not considered that "Shootersway" be considered as one overall neighbourhood "community" development – not 7 separate, non-contiguous sites, where separate developer objectives would deliver sub optimal social outcomes.</p>

That the plan to date has insufficiently covered the social isolation impacts of these sites, in particular sites Bk06 and Bk08, and how these sites can best be fully absorbed into the community.

No real attempt, or acceptance of commitments, to finding supporting transport solutions for these new, dispersed sites has been forthcoming, e.g. bus services.

As presented the Draft Local Plan does not address for the existing population how their existing social assets and facilities will be maintained and not overwhelmed.

How, as far as is practical, will existing quality of life standards be protected, maintained, and where shortfalls currently exist that they would be addressed.

will not seek to increase road capacity". (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer)

Attrition against car users, by resisting road improvement and adding to congestion, makes life difficult for everyone. More congestion, traffic delays, parking problems will impact by default on all - pedestrians, cyclists, bus users, commercial road users et al.

The Draft Local Plan is likely to create a "Catch 22". Wasting resources by tinkering at edge and not addressing crux of the problems,

More car usage is unavoidable, if population / housing is to be expanded. Not expanding and remodelling road infrastructure are not an acceptable alternative.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12492

**Person ID** 1269524

**Full Name** DAVID ATKINSON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12531
<b>Person ID</b>	1269539
<b>Full Name</b>	ms Lynne James
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12533
<b>Person ID</b>	1269456
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms R & C R & Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I was forced to have a water meter installed last summer because I live in a high water shortage stress area. How do you believe that building an addition 2,236 new houses in Berkhamsted/Northchurch (without considering the proposed expansion of Tring) will alleviate an already known water sensitive area.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12549
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Chapter Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy p222 onwards.</p> <p>The context is set out in the following text from p224 of the Draft Plan:</p> <p>In our comments to Q1, we have stated a number of issues that lead us to our position</p> <p>As recognised in Para 23.119 [Page 225] the Town experiences a high level of congestion:</p> <p>The following paragraph says: “there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town”. As a town set in a valley with only one main crossing, the county’s engineers comment that the traffic lights already operate at over capacity, with residents choosing to avoid the main roads in the town centre or travelling to shop elsewhere. Alternative routes are unlikely to be capable of being widened without very costly investment.</p> <p>The Draft Plan continues 23.121:</p> <p>The last sentence is an aspiration without a foundation to support it: the Plan offers no substantive detail that necessary strategic infrastructure or sustainable transport options, to provide access to the town centre and station, from the proposed development sites, other than by car, have been planned for.</p> <p>The referenced ‘Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy’ [Para 23.122] is nothing of the sort, mapping as it does junction enhancements at relatively minor side roads and crossings within the urban area and new/ widened footpaths along Shootersway.</p> <p>We also note the paragraph that refers to the town being served by a “key inter-urban Aylesbury – Hemel – Watford bus route”. Whilst the presence of said bus route – route 500 operated as a commercial service by Arriva - is correct, it operates at a frequency of 3 buses per hour on Monday- Friday, 2 buses per hour on Saturdays and 1 bus per hour on Sunday shopping hours. There is no evening service or early service on Saturdays. Due to its length, it also suffers from reliability issues. Despite fulfilling the criteria of a “good public transport service” in the Topic papers, there is the paucity of services in other directions from Berkhamsted. We do not agree that a sustainable transport network is in place in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>We note [p228] 23.129 and 23.130</p>



The Policy SP21 [p229] states:

Given recent experiences of applications that bear no resemblance to Master Plans *[although adopted as SPD]* residents will remain wary of such assurances.

The Introduction to the topic [Chapter 23, p 189] asserts:

“If this Draft Plan proceeds as set out, Berkhamsted residents will want to be assured that details for the key infrastructure needs to integrate the edge of town sites will be published prior to consultation on the Regulation 19 final plan.”

The Appendix attached comments on the critical importance of planning road and transport links at the outset so that residents have easy access to convenient options other than using their car.

23.134

While residents are concerned about the shortage of school places at secondary level in particular, the sustainability and viability of the secondary school will be under great pressure for many years until pupil numbers attract the funding to sustain the level of staffing provision necessary to support the school. This has not been addressed in the Draft Plan or IDP.

It is manifest that transport movements will add to congestion on Shootersway while Darrs Lane, a narrow country lane, will require major investment to support the additional traffic.

Increased traffic on Darrs Lane will also intensify congestion in Northchurch village centre.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Berkhamsted Citizens Assoc - RESPONSE - Reduced file size.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12553
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In general, the justification for including most of the Berkhamsted sites are a result of planners accepting the Central Government 'target' and claiming this as 'exceptional circumstances' despite a Central Government commitment to protecting the Green Belt. Most of these proposed allocations should be rejected. The weakness of infrastructure plans are highlighted elsewhere but for instance exactly how and by whom are the networks of new pedestrian links with adjacent allocations to be provided?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12554
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Bk01</b> South Berkhamsted. Green Belt. The 'Exceptional Circumstances' justifying removal from Green Belt are not specified. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how will Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times be kept as a 'secondary' access.  <b>See film made about this development for the last draft Local Plan.</b> <b><u><a href="http://www.deetv.tv/#south-berkhamsted-concept">http://www.deetv.tv/#south-berkhamsted-concept</a></u></b>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12589
<b>Person ID</b>	1269561
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Martin & Tracey Martin & Tracey Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12592
<b>Person ID</b>	1269561
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Martin & Tracey Martin & Tracey Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- **Northchurch** is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.
- The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12601

**Person ID** 1269563

**Full Name** Ms Ella Porter-Lough

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northchurch is a village and is therefore very connected to its beautiful local countryside. Building on Green belt here and in Dacorum is unlawful as it has not been proven to be necessary. Within minutes of my home I can walk into lovely countryside and enjoy the peace and fresh air it provides, as well as the nature that inhabits it. You can not undervalue its importance for our physical and mental well being which to be honest has been highlighted in this Pandemic</li> <li>We would lose our community and village identity as we meld into Berkhamsted. We are proud and see ourselves apart from Berkhamsted and wish to keep it this way. I've read mention of our village as 'West Berkhamsted' and this upsets me as we have lovely tree lined roads a plenty, drives for our cars to park on and our own real sense of identity quite different to Berkhamsted.</li> </ul> <p>Please see the bigger picture and realise how unreasonable your current proposal is,</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12700
<b>Person ID</b>	1269598
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Russ James
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>DRAFT DACORUM LOCAL PLAN 2020 – 2038</b></p> <p><b>PUBLIC CONSULTATION - RESPONSE FROM A BERKHAMSTED &amp; NORTHCHURCH PERSPECTIVE</b></p>

## 1 OVERVIEW and SUMMARY

- The attached comments and criticisms of the Dacorum Draft Local Plan (2020-2038 Emerging Strategy for Growth) are based on a viewpoint of a Berkhamsted and Northchurch resident.
- It is very apparent that the Local Plan is a product of predetermined conclusions, and very much Hemel Hempstead centric. **This is not acceptable.** Hemel Hempstead may be the largest population centre and so should attract most of the “commonwealth” facilities, **but** not to the exclusion of facility provision elsewhere in the District.

## 1 OPTIONS and DATA APPLIED

2.1. Some of the associated/ feeder documents to the Local Plan reveal that on occasions Dacorum BC have limited the scope of advisory studies, ensuring predetermine conclusions.

The Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study states: (para 1.4 “the Sustainable Transport Study is needed to ensure there is a robust basis for decision making in Berkhamsted and Tring as part of the Local Plan.” And. Para 2.24 “Being guided by the sustainable Transport Study’s objectives has ensured that types of interventions which are **less** likely to align with the objectives and policies should not be defined, or have been quickly ruled out ..... “ And, Para 8.13 “The Sustainable Transport Study deliberately avoids putting forward large-scale, expensive and complex infrastructure such as new road links and junctions, and major new public transport routes.”

Thus, not all options have been examined, measured and considered and then made available for public consideration.

**This is not acceptable “public consultation” being neither open or honest.**

Equally the Sustainable Transport Study does not show what are **volumes** of traffic flows currently and that projected at the end of the Local Plan, arising from the proposed new homes / population growth.

Therefore, the Draft Local Plan does not define the social impact of the proposed growth in the town and the reduction in the quality of life for all existing citizens.

Past local plans, and politicians standing for election, generally have promise that they want to make life better for all. Perhaps this local plan is a bit more honest in that it wants to reduce car usage by attrition – congestion, lack of parking, restricting / reconfiguring roads - thereby making commuting, shopping, visits to the countryside more difficult or limited for all residents, existing and new.

## **Dacorum is seeking acceptance of the Draft Local Plan.**

### **Seeking the “signing off” of the proverbial “blank cheque” is not open consultation.**

2.2. Unravelling the real impact on the local communities of the proposed Draft Local Plan (DLP) has been frustrating as:

- The document (DLP) and its “feeder” facts / figures / evaluations do not use consistent base data / statistics or clearly state the source / date / nature of the information. [In the case of Berkhamsted, in DLP statements the population data sometimes is Berkhamstead only, sometime including Northchurch, sometimes 2011 census, sometimes 2015/ 2017/ 2019 - so when then quoting growth volumes and rates to 2038 it is unclear as to the relative start point!
- Data used may be generally correct, but inappropriate. For example a table showing “transport modes used for journeys” only given in % terms, so **walking** is shown as 5.4% - but how many journeys? Another example quotes the number of commuting journeys – but is it for “to work” or total journeys (i.e. to and from)? Therefore, are the items being considered major or minor in relation to other matters?

#### **1 How can the public adequately consider issues based on unsuitable information?**

- Sometimes the impact is more obscure.

“**Milton Surgery** and **Boxwell Road Surgery** will relocate into the vacant wing of Gossoms End, an asset owned by NHS Property Services. This project is due to complete by January 2021 and the plans make provision for the housing growth forecasted in Berkhamsted. “

Gossoms End surgery already has acute parking problems, which will soon become even more acute.

#### **1 So how will Gossoms End Health Centre then cope (parking wise) with the additional demands from the sick young families, the disabled and the infirm arising from the new homes on Shootersway.**

The above is disclosed in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Draft local Plan does not reference any improvements to parking capacity at facilities outside of the central shopping area.

If we look at the information in the Draft Infrastructure Plan a little more closely it reveals that ever after current planned surgery upgrades / small projects there will be a shortage in current capacity for Primary Health Care in Berkhamsted.

Paragraph 12.17 and para 19.15 admit to the current capacity shortcomings but that “the plans make provision for the housing growth forecasted in Berkhamsted.”

There is no indication of what these plans are, or where the new surgeries might be located, and whether associated facility needs- transport / parking have been included in these “plans”.

## 1 TRANSPORT (Part 1 Issues)

3.1. The Draft Local Plan seeks to reduce the number of car journeys and increase the use of sustainable transport (buses, trains, walking, cycling).

The Draft Local Plan does not make clear:

- How this might be achieved other than by attrition and road congestion. This approach means a “price” has to be paid by all residents; all suffering a loss in quality of life and therefore is in conflict with every Local Plan policy.

***Not an acceptable approach.***

***Dissuade / discourage/educate = Yes.***

***Attrition = No.***

- For Berkhamstead (inc. Northchurch) the Rail service is operating near to maximum capacity. (stated). Providing cycle racks at the station aids nothing if all trains are full !
- No expansion of bus transport or new services are proposed for West Berkhamsted and Northchurch. (stated).

**If no additional buses and bus routes, particularly to areas of new housing, then how do Dacorum BC propose to reduce car dependency?**

- The Draft Plan has no strategy for providing additional employment capacity in Berkhamsted, indeed there is a risk of a small decrease due to losing the Jewson site and capacity at the BFI site. So, more homes, more residents, must equate to more out- commuting as percentage of population.



- For West Berkhamstead (including Northchurch) nearly 1000 houses, (including the 176 recently completed / in hand), are on sites that according to County definitions (HCC LTP4) and Dacorum site evaluations (Sustainability Appraisal Report - because of distance and topography) will **increase** dependence on the car for transport.

***How can car use (for commuting) be reduced if no transport alternatives available?***

- Both County and Dacorum documents admit that Maylands will be the prime employment site – not only for Dacorum but the surrounding economic area. Here also both County and Dacorum admit that Maylands has poor public transport links – particularly with the town centre and Railway station.

**This hardly encourages commuters to give up the car.**

- The Draft Local Plan does not disclose that Dacorum’s vision for 2050 (Dacorum Corporate Plan) is that Hemel Hempstead (and Maylands) will grow (by 2050) by 11,000 homes and 10,000 new jobs. [N.B. The 11,000 homes figure has subsequently been increased].

Doing a few simple calculations the only conclusions possible are as follows:

- Draft Local Plan growth (to 2038) are 10,600 homes in Hemel Hempstead and 16,600 across Dacorum.
- New Homes exceed New Jobs. Net result is more commuting out of the district.
- “First mile / Last Mile” issues arise from the new sites proposed due to their distance from local transport services (buses / trains) and if these services don’t quite go the desired distant point, **THEN** the private car is the **default**

Without a stellar change in alternative sustainable transport solutions the only answer is the increased use of personal transport i.e. the car. Also, average journey length will increase – a post 2011 base characteristic already observed and stated in Dacorum studies - reducing the potential market for practical use of cycling as a commuting option.

- Also means that local roads will be even more crowded and congested, increasing the dangers for cyclists, (and all other road users).
- The working environment has changed significantly over the last 20 years. No longer can one expect a job for life, but rather a worker can expect to have several retraining / job changes during a working life. To be employable a worker must be job flexible and travel flexible. Public transport infrastructures do not readily change to changing work travel patterns.
- Dacorum BC report, (in supporting documents but not openly disclosed in the Local Plan) that car usage will increase by **nearly 18%**.

[Not clear whether applies only for computing or also for social and domestic use??].

**Oops!** This figure only relates for growth up to 2031 – the Plan supposedly covers to **2038!!** Therefore, for Berkhamsted the likely increase in traffic levels – commuting and domestic – **will increase by 25%+ by 2038.**

- The County view (HCC-LTP4) states “Peak hour car trips are forecast to increase by 18% by 2031, which will impact on the environment, **quality of life** and ***puts pressure on the council to respond with increases in highway capacity***”

**1 *Why is the Draft Local Plan unwilling to publicly disclose this issue for Dacorum, and particularly Berkhamsted, and seek to plan accordingly?***

- The current Coronavirus pandemic has given rise to great economic pressures and a significant increase in “home working” with a lower level of commuting journeys. Domestic journeys have also been significantly impacted by the pandemic Lockdown regulations. Only time will show whether the business situation will have a lasting and beneficial effect on commuting travel volumes. If more “home working” (full or part time) is the long-term outcome then an impact on “domestic” in-town travel levels may arise.

- The net result is that Dacorum in general, and Berkhamsted and Tring in particular, will become dormitory / commuting towns to feed the wider area. Relatively, commuting levels will increase at a higher rate than the population growth, and average journey lengths will increase and due to added congestion (admitted in Dacorum documents and HCC LTP4), that journey times will increase.

- The Draft Local Plan states (and plans reflect) “will not seek to increase road capacity”. (Draft Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer)

- Increased road use (+25%), but no increase in road capacity means a reduced quality of life for all;

-

- However, this does not seem apply to expansion of Hemel Hempstead.

**This is not an acceptable approach – a policy not applying to Hemel Hempstead – and not as per County policy – HCC LTP4 for areas with topology characteristics such as Berkhamsted, i.e. “Dispersed” - see para 5.2. below**

**1 HOUSING FORECASTS AND SITES**

**4.1. OVERVIEW – DACORUM PERSPECTIVE.**

The desire of the Government to increase the level of house building nationally is understood. However, the Government's pressure to increase homes delivered using a "one size fits all" formulae is a very crude approach, particularly when applied for the next 18 years through Local Plans.

A long-term action to what might be a short-term problem, incurring the "law of unintended consequences".

Government policies come, and Government policies go.

To plan for 18 years ahead, based on uncharacteristic figures, will unnecessarily remove land from the protection of "Green Belt" status.

Current planning rules, including the proposed PIP principles, requires Local Authorities to respond to developer's timetables for developing identified Local Plan sites. Thus, a community need led growth planning approach is being replaced with a patchwork growth pattern driven by the needs of the developers.

Should the imposed demand of local growth not arise in the middle to long term the borough could be left with "islands" of developed land that don't easily fit with cohesive communities.

To front end building targets and release of suitable sites within the Local Plan period may be a more realistic approach of meeting Government aspirations and maintaining living communities. (Using the 10 + 5 year plan approach?)

It is noted that, applying Government principles, the Draft Local Plan (para 1.37 applies) is built on delivery of an average 922 homes p.a. for the period 2020-2038, and that the previous Local Plan (2013) was based on homes growth of 430 p.a.

The draft Local Plan has applied and distributed growth through the Borough as follows:-

- **Analysis of Characteristics of Local Plan Growth:**

Sites already granted planning – “Approved” – are ignored. They are now a “fact” and further debate would be meaningless. “Windfall” is by definition an unknown and a “brownfield” growth, (and unless such growth does not materialize demanding further release of green belt), can equally be ignored at this stage.

As such it is the nature, location and distribution of new sites that merits scrutiny.

In general, “Brownfield” sites arise in an urban/ town centre setting, attracting a higher housing density when developed. Therefore, the Draft Local Plan’s impact on land usage becomes as follows:

Note:

- Above figures do not include the Dacorum BC proposed post 2038 reservation, i.e. the removal from the Green Belt of 161 Hectares of Land (4000 homes) for possible later expansion of Hemel Garden City.

**This element should be withdrawn from the Local Plan:-**

- See above para 4.1. Green Belt protection should be maintained until need is assured.
- The 5-7 year Local Plan reviews allow for assured reappraisal of the growth situation and later inclusion should need dictate.
- The use of this possible development is a joint action with St.Albans. Their Local Plan is under review after being assessed as “unsound”.
  
- The above figures included under “Greenfield” several sites that were removed from the Green Belt in the 2013 approved Local Plan; sites that have yet to be developed. As such to the general population they would be loss of Green / Open space.

**Summary**

- The Draft Local Plan calls for **81%** of all growth to be on Green Belt land.
- This rises to **93%** of all growth being on “Green Belt” when ex Green Belt land c/f from 2013 Plan is included.
- Over **95%** of homes on new sites will be in Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring (85% of population).
- Commercial requirements, (Offices, industrial, lorry parks etc.) will be **92%** built in the Green Belt and represent 14% of total land usage.
- The below table shows how Dacorum has pushed Green Belt erosion onto the two main towns within the Borough.

- **Population Growth.**

Dacorum has based its planning assumption for new homes on 922 units p.a. (over 18 years to 2038 = 16,596 units). The previous Local Plan was based on 430 units per annum.

Official information sources, (supported by Herts CC and Dacorum BC), indicate household growth in Dacorum, 2020 to 2038, will be in the range of 17,000 – 20,000. Data available also suggests the average number of people per household will move downwards from about 2.4 to (lower level) of 2.25.

Ave Persons per H/Hold 2.4

Ave Persons per H/Hold 2.25

Homes

p.a.

Homes

p.a.

Low Growth - 17,000 people

7080

393

7560

420

Medium Growth – 18,500 people

7710

428

8220

457

Higher Growth - 20,000 people

8330

463

8880

494

Therefore, likely household growth might be in the range of 400 to 500 homes per annum.

The effect of this on the demand for **new sites in the Green Belt** becomes as per the following table: (Assumption being that Approved developments and Windfall remain as per).

- **The Way Forward?**

LGA's nationwide have raised concerns about the inappropriate nature of the Government's "one size fits all" housing target. The debate continues.

The NPPF and "Planning for the Future" are clear that encroachment of growth into the Green Belt can only be proposed in **exceptional circumstances**.

The Draft Local Plan says "need" is exceptional, but does explain the logic of the approach, (paras 19.5/19.6).

The current plan calls for **81%** of all growth to be in the Green Belt. **This is exceptional and has not been justified.**

In consultation responses to recent Government proposals for revising planning policies, Dacorum has queried the validity of some planning approaches, e.g.

**" Standard Method for establishing housing requirement figures (Proposal 4)**

The suggestion that this should take into local constraints is welcomed. What is not clear is what those constraints may be and how they may be weighted in settling the final figure.

The new method is still heavily driven by national policy objectives to achieve a target of 300,000 new homes per annum as opposed to more accurately reflecting likely local levels of housing need.



Housing targets would be set by national government and would be 'binding' on local authorities. **This represents the centralisation of housing targets and a further retrograde step for localism and local democracy.** “

“ We do not agree that development in Protected areas should fall back to current permitted development rights. The present array of permitted development rights is wide ranging and there are proposals to further extend this further. **It is essential that development is reviewed with local engagement in these sensitive areas in order to afford them appropriate and effective protection.** “

**“ Pillar 3 – Planning for infrastructure and connected places**

Dacorum Borough Council would advise Government to tread carefully when seeking to unravel and rebuild a fundamental pillar supporting the planning system. S.106 agreements not only secure the delivery of numerous development obligations.

We strongly support the proposal to capture a greater proportion of the land value that occurs when permission is granted. **Communities need to see the direct benefit of accepting growth in their areas through greater investment in infrastructure provision locally.** “

The above attitudes are not reflected in the Draft Local Plan as offered for public consideration.

**The Draft Local Plan in terms of its housing targets and sites selected for development are rejected:**

- **The imposed housing targets are unacceptable and take no meaningful account of actual need.**
- **The “exceptional circumstances” for 81% of growth to be met by encroachments into the Green Belt has not been shown and justified.**
- **The proposals for Berkhamsted and Tring that about 90% of homes on new sites are in the Green Belt is not acceptable.**

- The only way to protect the Green Belt, and manage the release of land for development is to employ clear land release phases with the Local Plan using factors such as the 10+5 year allowed in central planning policies.
- The Draft Local Plan does not challenge the housing targets.

## 1 HOUSING TARGETS AND SITES IN WEST BERKHAMSTED.

5.1. Dacorum have in this Draft Local Plan included the parish of Northchurch as being part of Berkhamsted in developing this Local Plan.

Overall, the housing target for Berkhamsted is listed as:

<b>Berkhamsted Housing target</b>	
<b>2020 – 2038</b>	
Committed	143
New Sites	1876
Windfall	<u>217</u>
	2236 homes

78% of all new homes will be built in the Green Belt – the Hemel Hempstead figure = 14%. Over 90% of the New Sites are currently Green Belt.

- The topology of Berkhamsted is that it is situated in a steep sided valley, current activity mainly being spread along the valley floor. The majority of the proposed new sites are away from the village centre and along the valley ridge.

This growth pattern is described as “**Dispersed**” by Hertfordshire County Council in their **Travel Plan Guidance – HCC LTP4**. The characteristics being:

- **Distributed growth means existing settlements do not grow or densify substantially making passenger transport and sustainable travel solutions potentially less viable.**

- Spread of developer funding and mitigation reduces potential to deliver significant enhancements of existing sustainable transport provision.
- This spatial development form is best served by car-based transport, as complex origin and destination patterns of travel will continue.
- Increased demand of the highway network requiring highway upgrades and improvements.
- 
- Increased car use with implications for quality of life, human health, the environment and energy consumption.

The above situation is endorsed in Dacorum's own Sustainability Appraisal Report (Appendix E refers) where of the 13 nominated sites (1876 homes) some 8 sites covering **90%** of new homes (1680) will have above normal car usage.

- 1 a) How does Dacorum BC expect to achieve reduced car usage?
- 2 b) Which community group(s) will “pay” for this loss of personal freedom if reduced car usage is to be achieved?

**P.S.** a). One of the 5 remaining sites where car usage will decrease is “Bk13 – Gossoms End” where Dacorum's Sustainability Appraisal Report states *“The site is located fairly close to the town centre which could decrease the need to travel by car to access facilities and would therefore reduce the growth in airborne emissions.”* And *“Although development resulted in the loss of a car sales and timber yard, this will be replaced by a food supermarket (and housing) and therefore employment opportunities should be maintained.”*

I am sure that the potential developers of the “food supermarket” – a major chain – will appreciate that their new site will attract a reduced number of car shoppers!

- 1 b) Similar “Howlers” in the Appraisal Report indicate Dacorum's lack of knowledge and understanding of Berkhamsted its urban hinterland:

SA Category  
SA Description  
Score  
**Comment**

### **Land East of Darr's Lane**

13

Housing

Development of this site would provide c.300 new dwellings. .

ü

Draft Local Plan = 200 homes. Perhaps 300 = long term potential. If so what is L/T potential for all other sites.

IDP = 378 homes !!

11

Sustainable locations

The site is located at a distance from the town centre but relatively close to the facilities in Northchurch and is close to a strategic employment site

ü

Facilities = 1 shop + 1 chippy. Parking inadequate. These facilities over 900 metres from site via single track lane with no pavements. Employment over 1.5 km away on other side of valley.

### **Rossway Farm**

11

Sustainable locations

The site is located at a distance from the town centre and the local bus service is infrequent.

ü

Never has been a bus service along Shootersway

13

Housing

The proposal would allow 40 new dwellings

ü

Draft Local Plan suggests 200 homes.

### **Jewson's Site**

11

Sustainable locations

Whilst the site is on the edge of the town it is located near a school and local centre

ü

Not on Edge of Town. About 1.5km in from North end of town.

Oh, and while we are at it, the Draft Local Plan paras 23.106 and 23.107 (page 224) do not accord with data shown in **Policy SP20** (pages 227/8).

5.3. Approximately half of housing growth will occur in South Berkhamsted, and except for about 4% growth within the town, the remainder is scheduled for the North / West of the town settlement. The below table illustrates:

Homesmes

- In respect of the North/West sites the “true” impact of the proposed Local Plan should reflect that the BFI may need to site exit via Shootersway and that above figures should include the 176 homes recently built / in construction at Durrants Lane / Shootersway.
- **SP21 (Draft Local Plan)** states a “masterplan” (i.e. an SPD) has yet to be developed.
- **SP22 (Draft Local Plan)** similarly states a “masterplan” (i.e. an SPD) has yet to be developed.
- Therefore, in terms of Shootersway, we are viewing a (series of) development(s) for **1006** homes (740 + 90 BFI + 176 existing / in hand), spread over 7 sites, with various site owners each with potentially conflicting objectives.

**A fully developed SPD is necessary for the entire Shootersway area in order to ensure a balanced sustainable community development strategy is generated, including the desired provision of community “commonwealth” facilities, e.g. play areas, real “open / green” spaces, neighbourhood centre (?), possible health support facilities, schools., etc.**

**This SPD will need to recognize, respect and, as far as possible, incorporate the existing Shootersway homes, which have a different morphology and social origin to the new incoming developments.**

Ideally the Local Plan should indicate the desired phases of land release to achieve a cohesive community growth.

Until full and acceptable SPD's are developed and offered for public consideration it is not possible to support the Local Plan as presented.

- Other **SP22** issues to be addresses also include:
- Draft Local Plan para 23.134 still refers to only 500 homes at West Berkhamsted.
- SP21 and SP22 seem confused as to which sites are in South Berkhamsted and those in West Berkhamsted.
- No reflection of local facility needs of existing Shootersway residents, and those for the proposed new sites, for services such as health facilities.
- Current Draft Local Plan documents do not show an overall / overview of a rational plan for **cycleway** improvement **OR** new / enhanced public transport (bus) services.
- It appears that the town section of the A4251 (London Road / High Street) is unsuitable for dedicated cycle lanes; cyclists therefore will have to share road capacity with all other users.
  - Encouraging cycle use, will give rise to occasions of road congestion on the A4251, and slower journeys for all road users. Effectively reducing road capacity.
  - Such events may disrupt bus timetables and if events become regular and substantial may discourage bus usage over a wider area than just Berkhamsted, (500 service).
- The Plan does not show provision of any bus terminal / layover provisions / road investments that would help bus service providers come forward with service offerings.

5.4. For the 7 sites indicated for Shootersway, (inc BFI), Dacorum's' Sustainability Appraisal Report suggests that **these 7 sites are unsuitable** as measured against 15 sustainability criteria.

Of the 15 measure, there are 4 criteria that are of dubious relativity to the matter of a site's sustainability; namely:

**Code**

**Site Location**

**Impact**

**Comment**

SA12

Community Cohesion

good

Debatable for some sites listed.

SA13

Housing

good

Obviously – any site would earn a ü

SA14

Economy

good

Obviously – any site would earn a ü

SA15

Employment

good

?? no employment capacity increase planned for Berkhamsted.

These criteria would apply to any site proposed, (unless located in the mid-Atlantic), so have no value in evaluating whether a site is socially sustainable - good or bad. Taking this into account in considering the 7 sites listed for Shootersway we have the following results:

Site

Sustainability Appraisal

Revised Score

Poor Impact



Good Impact

Poor Impact

Good Impact

British Film Institute

5

5

5

2

Haslems Playing Field

7

4

7

1

Hanbury's

7

5

7

1

Blegberry Gardens

7

5

7

1

East of Darr's Lane

6

6

6

2

Rossway Farm

7

5

7

1

Hanbury's 2

7

5

7

1

5.5. On either of the above "rankings" the Shootersway sites are not sustainable, and they also contravene Dacorum's Policies; namely:

SP7, DM30, DM31, DM32, DM50, DM52, DM53, DM54, and for Lock Field add DM27, DM33(part).

**As such none of the West Berkhamsted site can be supported at this stage as they are non-sustainable and rely on an unjustified forecast of home demand.**

- **SOCIAL COHESION (for the Shootersway Proposed Sites)**

Correctly the new development sites will help address the shortages of affordable, first homes and homes for the elderly.

The current County norms for existing housing areas are 17% of homes have no car and 42% having only 1 family vehicle.

It is suggested that these averages are likely to be under-estimates of car deprivation to the home / occupant mix suggested for these new sites on Shootersway.

- The geographical characteristics of the “Shootersway” sites and its impact on the transport limitations of the day-time car less families (say 50-60%) is recognized in the County’s LTP4 – “ *Barriers to walking and cycling are similar – they come under the broad categories of safety and security factors, lack of physical infrastructure, social and cultural attitudes, weather conditions, purpose of the journey (e.g. carrying shopping), topography, health and a lack of knowledge, awareness, training or education.*”
- Local roads and paths are inadequate, as are local shopping facilities. The distance from the town centre is beyond easy walking especially when considered in relation to the steep valley sides. Coupled with no bus services proposed or bus friendly infrastructure planned, will only increase the social separation issues for these sites.
- These access /travel shortcomings will particularly impact on the car-less residents of these sites, and therefore fall disproportionately on young families and elderly due to the site remoteness, lacking services and steep access to the sites.
- It is, as yet, unclear how the “Shootersway” sites will be supported by adequate health and welfare facilities, such in part depending on SPD’s yet to be developed and agreed by developers and statutory service providers.

**The Draft Local Plan does not acknowledge these social pressures or how they might be ameliorated.**

#### **5.7. DARR's LANE (Bk06) and ROSSWAY FARM (Bk08) SITES - LOCATION ISSUES**

Northchurch has been included as part of "Berkhamsted" for this "emerging growth strategy". Northchurch is a parish of some 2800 people, including the hamlets of Dudswell (inc. Norcott Hill), Northchurch Common and part of Cow Roast.

- Only Northchurch **village** directly abuts the NW edge of Berkhamsted – population about 1800 people.
- The new sites proposed on Shootersway which are in the parish of Northchurch, (plus those under construction) **total 484 homes** - a potential population increase of over 1150 people.

The Northchurch "Shootersway" sites are **Bk06** (Darr's Lane – 200 homes) + **Bk08** (Rossway Farm – 200 homes) + **Berroc** phase 2 (84 homes).

[If the Lock Field development is included, total houses = 544, with a population impact of 1,300. Making parish growth of over 45%. This is unacceptable – all sites being Green Belt.]

**The developments Bk06 and Bk08 are not acceptable in the form currently proposed, reasons include:**

- Effectively creating a new Northchurch village of almost equivalent size **but** –
- Separated from the historic Northchurch settlement by two **single** track roads – Darr's Lane and Bell lane – that are unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles and have **no footpaths**. Does not facilitate absorbing the new homes into a social cohesive whole. Darr's Lane is over **900 metres** from the nearest local shop and **6 km** from Berkhamsted centre. Rossway Farm is even more remote.
- These 2 named sites (Bk06 and BK08) cover more than half of **all** the **new** homes proposed on Shootersway.
- The Northchurch village centre shopping facility is extensively used, but has a shortage of short-term parking, coupled with a poor junction configuration with the A4251 often resulting in temporary blocking of the A4251. Including the above identified access issues from the hilltop sites limits the asset value of the shopping facility for these new homes.

- Northchurch, and much of West Berkhamstead are lacking in basic service facilities, thus the community cannot readily absorb the social pressures arising from the proposed population growth. (Reflected in resident satisfaction surveys - **see Para 6**).
- The sites in Shootersway will not match the morphology of existing areas of housing.
- Therefore, sites Bk06 and Bk08 will not support a real unified and sustainable community. These sites, which are the most distant from central Berkhamsted and its attractions are likely to exhibit problems of social isolation.
- These sites are not sustainable on Dacorums only assessments of Site Sustainability.

**The Draft Local Plan does not recognise the additional needs that arise in establishing a embracing community environment arising from the location of the sites and the lackings in the local infrastructure.**

#### **5.9. Site Bk06 – Darr’s Lane -Other Concerns –**

It is also proposed to accommodate a new school and public park facility on this development.

The Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan states “HCC are seeking two new **primary** schools – one in the **west (2FE – BK06 area)** and one in the east (3FE – SA2). **One new secondary school (8FE site) is required, to be located in the west**, to meet need arising from developments.”

However, the Draft Local Plan, and its site allocation details indicate that the Secondary school will be sited on Bk06 (6FE site). Not **(8FE!)**. Where the primary school will be located is unclear(!).

**Clarity is desired in respect to the following:**

- What will be the area (Ha) allocated to each of the site uses – homes, education, public park/SANG and where on the site these will be sited?
- What will be the potential catchment area for the new school?

- Therefore, what will be the points of access for the school and public park, for pedestrian, cycle and car users in view of Bell Lane and Darr's Lane being single track roads with no pathways. What are the likely additional travel plan loads, (pedestrian, cycle, car journeys), to be added to local road that are already under congestion stress.
- The Draft Local Plan site proposals (page 305) indicates that the school access could be via Darr's Lane or from within the site. Such comments show a complete lack of understanding of local built area, its characteristics, topology and road capacity.

Without demolition of existing homes a Darr's Lane access could only from the pavement less, single track, steeply inclined portion of Darr's Lane. To provide an "on site" access would be out of "norm" for a new housing site – and only moves the problem.

The Transport study says of Darr's Lane is "a Quite, rural single lane road towards Shootersway which **might** create visibility issues." **Might ???!!**

Obviously, the transport study people did not travel along and assess **Darr's Lane – it is not a quiet "Lane", and has visibility issues galore.**

Darr's Lane exhibits every "road safety" issue possible yet has **no** Transport Study recommendation for road safety / pedestrian /cycling improvement.

See attached Appendix of street photographs.

- The potential school portion of the site (Bk06) will be bounded by Granville Road.

Bell Lane and Granville Road are not included in the Transport Strategy road evaluations (Appendix A), nor is New Road – location of the Lock Field proposed site.

Granville Road slopes steeply and, partly because of this characteristic, is effectively a single-track road due to parked vehicles. It is also a bus route.

See attached Appendix of street photographs.

- The proposed Public Park / SANG is a welcome addition to the Green space / LEAP /NEAP needs of the local community. The Public Park although (just) within Northchurch Parish has reduced benefit (for Northchurch) due to its distance from large segments of the village population.
- These sites do not comply with Dacorum policies DM30, DM 31, DM 32(part), DM50, DM 52, DM53 and DM54.

**Conclusion: Until more details of development conditions and access arrangements, i.e. SPD and supporting data, meaningful consideration of Bk06 and Bk08 sites is not possible.**

**Considerable development, density, access and social deficiency issues arise in respect of these sites. The Draft Local Plan neither references such issues or proposes solutions.**

- **SITE Bk07 – LOCK FIELD, NEW ROAD (NORTHCHURCH). – 60 homes.**

This site has been owned by a property development company for several decades and earlier planning applications have been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate.

I can only consider that the inclusion now of this site in the latest Dacorum Draft Local Plan (2020-2038) arises from pressure on Dacorum to achieve new home numbers externally imposed.

- **This site should be withdrawn from the list of proposed sites.**

Withdrawing of this site will result in a minor loss of homes growth potential - less than 0.4% of the District target. So, its retention is not critical to achieving overall objectives. To retain Lock Field would cause significant amenity damage and endanger road safety.

- The Draft Local Plan and Sustainable Transport Study are inadequate:
- Development of this site has incurred rejection by the Planning Inspectorate, on Green Belt, Access and Road Safety issues.

- Site Proposals (Draft Local Plan pages 307/308) :
  - Biodiversity: “The site - deliver enhancements to the wildlife corridor along the Grand Union Canal”.

**How can loosing Green Belt to housing enhance biodiversity?**

- “Access to be provided from London Road”.

**How? [London Road is 4km away; a new bridge over the canal??].**

- Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity: “Enhance the wildlife corridor along the River Bulbourne”.

**?!? Not near the River Bulbourne; the river is on the other side of the canal and flows through allotments and a school recreation/ playing field green area. No details of where can / needs improvement.**

- The Transport Study is also lacking.
  - There is no “Road” assessment of New Road in the Transport Study Appendix A. If an assessment had been done the following would have been noted.
    - The entry to the Lock Field site is not visible, due to bridge structure, for New Road traffic coming from A4251.
    - Proposing a 2nd raised uncontrolled crossing near the school where the north side path starts nowhere and goes nowhere!
- Transport Study Appendix F suggests that the road improvements proposed for the Lock Field development would also give the following – “. The intervention has potential to **improve sustainable transport options** to proposed development sites in Berkhamsted.”

**Great trick if achievable. New Road has 3 buses a day going to Aldbury! All other sites over 1Km+ distant, on other side of A4251, on the other side of the valley.**

- No acknowledgement that New Road, B4506, is one of the few access roads into the Ashridge / Chiltern AONB. A much-appreciated facility for a wider area than just Berkhamsted. Access to AONB facility is by private transport, and private transport growth is unavoidable as population grows.

**Reasons for rejecting this proposed site – Lock Field (Bk07) include:**

- Green Belt – Biodiversity loss will be incurred not a biodiversity gain.



- The Grand Union towpath, facing this site, is one of the few “Countryside” and Open land assets for the local community and is much used by cyclist, pedestrians, joggers and dog walkers.
- The towpath is therefore a vital health facility, physical and mental, for local residents.
  - An unobstructed countryside view up the valley-side to towards the Ridge of the Chiltern AONB being an essential part of the health benefits attainable, providing a feeling of escape from ever encroaching urban landscape and its pressures.
- Green space provisions in this part of Berkhamsted / Northchurch are particularly in short supply giving greater “worth” to the few assets that are available. See para 6.
- New Road, B4506, is one of the few gateways in the Chilterns AONB / Ashridge. Although this part of New Road has a bus service, it does not serve Ashridge (in terms of frequency). Access to this vital part of the Countryside, for Berkhamsted, Hemel Hempstead and the wider areas, will cause an increased in traffic levels on New Road and traffic volumes thro’ West Berkhamsted / Northchurch in general.
- This traffic, increasing as above, has to negotiate a single-track bridge over the Grand Union Canal. This restricts the capacity of the New Road and raises several road safety aspects including that for the primary school in New Road.
- The entry point to the Lock Field site is unacceptable.
  - The site entry cannot be seen by vehicles coming from the A4251 direction until they are committed to crossing the bridge.
  - Likewise, traffic exiting the Lock Field site will not be able to see traffic coming from the A4251.
  - Traffic from the Lock Field site will have a limited view up New Road in the Ashridge direction unless the visibility splay is widened, removing even more of an ancient hedgerow.
- The Transport Study suggests the Stop line before the single-track bridge on the Ashridge side will need to be moved back, up the hill, to be behind the new Lock Field entry point. This coupled with additional path works proposed on the “school” side of New Road bridge increases the effective length of the single-track section over the canal bridge.
  - This extra length of “single-track” working adds extra time for vehicles to traverse the section. Therefore, larger time gaps are required between vehicles before a change in traffic flow direction can be safely undertaken. The overall effect will be a net reduction in the traffic carrying capacity of New Road, one of the few entry points into the local AONB area.
  - The existence of the Lock Field road entry / exit to before the Ashridge side Stop Line, will cause uncertainty and a road hazard when vehicles are present at the Lock Field and the Ashridge Stop point in New Road.
  - General road safety will be impaired – not improved, for an area covering a primary school.
- Permitting development of this site, and its incursion into the Green Belt, removes the protection for retaining the matching “triangle” of amenity land to that of Lock Field; that is the contiguous triangle of canal-side land in the Dudswell direction.

A further loss to the value of the Towpath amenity.

Access, at Dudswell, would equally be via a single-track bridge; despoil Dudswell unique character of a rural hamlet in a conservation area and create a “ribbon development” joining Berkhamsted, with Northchurch with Dudswell.

- The Lock Field development with its attached roadway “improvements” – do not fully reflect the long outstanding road safety needs of St. Mary’s School.
- Lock Field is adjacent to a conservation area and the Transport Study proposals for road enhancements will result in a loss of car parking spaces to homes in a conservation area. No alternative car parking options / solutions have been tabled.
- Lock Field development does not comply with the Draft local Plan policies listed for the other sites lists in the Draft Local Plan – see Para 5.5 above. In addition, Lock Field is non-compliant with policies DM27, and DM33 (part).

**For all of the above reasons the Lock Field proposed site should be withdrawn from the 2020-2038 Local Plan.**

## **1 GREEN / OPEN AND PLAY FACILITIES.**

6.1. Northchurch and West Berkhamsted are poorly served with green / open and play facilities. These shortcomings are of long standing and have not been adequately addressed in past Local Plans; this Draft Local Plan equally does not address these shortcomings.

- New research by the Consumer Data Research Centre (CRDC) into the features of neighbourhoods that impact on health, measured on a scale of 1 to 10 – **with 1 being the healthiest and 10 the least**, produced the following outcomes:  
Influencing factors include air quality, restaurants, GP /dentist services and leisure services.
- Berkhamsted varied between 2/3 with the town centre the “healthiest”.
- **Northchurch had a score of 6.**(poor)
  
- Page 223 of the Draft Local Plan shows the proposed new housing areas, and also the existing (?) “open / green spaces”. For North and West Berkhamsted, **8** open spaces are indicated, as follows:

### **Open Spaces**

Nature

Number

Open for public use

Schools

3

No

Private House

1

No

Private Land

Woodland (Cox's Dell)

1

No

HCC/DBC owned

Allotments

1

No

Adj to Sports Centre

1

Yes

1 x LEAP

Open Land

1

No

Now 176 Houses

- An open / green space with play facilities and a football pitch, is Northchurch Recreation Ground, sited in the Green Belt adjacent to the A4251 on the Northchurch village boundary.
- For its beauty, serenity and views, and the lack of alternative “green” facilities, the Grand Union Canal is a highly valued recreational and health asset to Berkhamsted and Northchurch.
- The towpath is a recognised cycleway and therefore an important community asset. The Canal and Rivers (Charitable) Trust promote tow-path recreational use by pedestrians and cyclists.
- Although signed for joint use, and signage stating that cyclists should give priority to pedestrians; alas good behaviour by some cycle users is lacking.
- Towpath surface is very poor in places, width in places is unsafe if dual use is to be further promoted, and signage would benefit from attention. A full survey is suggested. The Canal and River trust has limited resources, but towpath upgrades to improve recreational use (and as a road alternative) can be considered for CIL/s106 support.
- The Northchurch (Village) access point to the Grand Union Canal towpath is via New Road bridge – a single track bridge – with no footpath on the towpath entry side. A safety issue that is still not recognised in highways work programmes.
- Current Local Plan documents do not indicate any improvement to open spaces / green spaces provisions in the existing village area. The Bk06 (Darr’s Lane) development proposes a community Park /SANG however its location, due to its distance from the core of Northchurch village, limits its value for Northchurch residents but no doubt it would be a welcome addition for West Berkhamsted.
- The residents of the new Shootersway sites may wish to avail themselves of such recreational benefits of walking / cycling along the towpath of the Grand Union Canal. Distance, topology and the shortage of safe walking / cycling routes is likely to limit the range of residents who can avail themselves of this recreational facility.
- Dacorum’s Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (page 145) indicates that all the proposed Berkhamsted sites could raise **£6.6M**, (s106/CIL/IL fees), for Green and Play facilities.

I presume the LAPs/LEAPs/NEAPs will be on or close to the new sites?

This leaves some **£4.8M** for new Green infrastructure and games pitches and changing rooms in Berkhamsted.

**Have Dacorum have any views as to where these Green Amenity areas and games pitches / changing rooms might be sited?**

6.2. On the topic of needs for improved recreational facilities in Berkhamsted. Policy DM62 states:

**“Policy DM62 - Sport and Leisure**

- 1 All new residential development will be expected to contribute towards additional sport and playing pitch provision. These will be calculated using Sport England’s Playing Pitch Calculator (for outdoor sports pitches).
  
- 1 All new residential development in Hemel Hempstead will be expected to contribute towards additional leisure facilities provision. These will be calculated using Sport England’s Sport Facility Calculator.....”

**Why the subtle difference? Oh! It means no S106/CIL fees for supporting Swimming or other indoor sports facilities in the non-Hemel areas of Dacorum!!**

Looking at the Dacorum Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan the following factors come to light:

- Page144 (Para 19.6). “ Key issues for Berkhamsted include:
  - Capacity of existing local infrastructure.
  - Lack of open spaces.
  - **The Berkhamsted sports centre is in need of an upgrade.**
  - Congestion on the local road network, particularly in the town centre.
  - Local bus services are modest, and the valley topography discourages walking and cycling. “
  
- But, But.... The Infrastructure Delivery Plan then states – Para 19.40 (page 152) “There is no identified need for indoor sport or waterspace in Berkhamsted. “
  
- So why has the Council indicated that the Berkhamsted Sportscentre be considered for replacements, and that feasibility studies be completed.

**This contradiction and provision of 2nd class treatment of Berkhamstead and Tring residents is not acceptable.**

## 1 FURTHER TRANSPORT CONCERNS.

7.1. Earlier adopted versions of the Local Plan indicated that Shootersway was designated as a **Secondary** traffic route for the West side of Berkhamsted, (Charles Street/Shrublands/Westfield Road and Granville Road were similarly designated).

Classifying Shootersway as a **Secondary** Distributor road, with Cross Oaks Road, Durrants Lane, Bell Lane and Darr's Lane as the **Local** Distributor roads is a more meaningful description of their function.

7.2. The A416, Chesham Road, is the main cross-country entry road into Berkhamstead meeting the main North-South A4251 in the centre of town.

From the entry point into the town limits, the A416 becomes Kings Road and is width limited in parts. Hence many vehicles – car and commercial – use Shootersway as a “rat run” to avoid the town's high street (A4251).

- The Sustainable Transport Study confirms Shootersway usage status.
- Shootersway provides (correctly) direct access for the long-standing employment /commercial transport site at Spring Garden Lane, despite highway signs stating Shootersway is unsuitable for heavy vehicles.
- The lack of a recent and detailed traffic flow statistics for Berkhamsted hampers meaningful decision making.
- The Sustainable Transport Study concentrated on commuting travel patterns. Little was stated or known of the daytime “Social, domestic and Pleasure” travel patterns.

7.3. Except for Durrants Lane, all the other roads fed by Shootersway (and Vis Versa) – Cross Oaks Road, Bell Lane and Darr's Lane –are single-track or have single-track sections.

- Durrants Lane is a two-way road, also serving a primary school – a safety issue.
- Cross Oaks Road has exceedingly limited options for resolving its single-track situation.
- Bell Lane is virtually all single track, lightly used and does not directly connect with the High Street / A4251.

- Three of the roads may be called “Lanes” but are certainly not (by usage) “Lanes”, so should be treated and maintained as true Local Distributor roads.

This leaves **Darr’s Lane** as the only available option for providing additional throughput capacity, despite it not being an ideal solution.

- The Darr’s Lane site (Bk06), as proposed in the Draft Local Plan will accommodate 200 homes, a 6FE Secondary School, (possible also a primary school?) and a public Park.
- The site Bk06 (Darr’s Lane) is bounded by 4 roads – **none** of which were fully appraised in the Transport study.
  - Bell Lane is single-track along its length, and poorly maintained.
  - Granville Road is narrow due to parked cars, pavements are blocked and is a bus route.
  - Shootersway may be the primary entry for the 200 (Bk06) homes – but it is noted that no footpath provision is planned for on the Shootersway site boundary!
  - Access points for the school, which is proposed for an extremely steep part of the site, have not been adequately defined.

7.4. Despite advisory “white on blue” signs on Darr’s Lane and Shootersway regarding the roads being unsuitable for heavy vehicles; both are frequently used by heavy commercial traffic. If a full survey / site visit was undertaken for the Sustainable Transport Study, it would have reported that Darr’s Lane has **significant** traffic visibility issues and also that the single-track sections are being badly damaged by misuse.

In the top section of Darr’s Lane it is becoming, in places, partially two-track, but still twisty, as vehicles have ground away at the roadway verge in forcing their way through.

Ancient hedgerows are being lost. Damaged road edges / removed verge areas being infilled with rubble and tarmac on an ad-hoc basis by Highways. The “Lane” is showing clear signs of general ongoing neglect, although a small section at the top end was resurfaced about 3-4 years ago.

The above problems are of long standing due to historical financial neglect of the local road infrastructure. The proposed home / population growth, defined in the Draft Local Plan, will add significantly to current infrastructure shortcomings.

If enhancements to Darr’s Lane were deemed possible then the capacity issues at the High Street end would also need to be similarly addressed to provide a balanced solution.

See attached Appendix for photographic evidence of the local road situation.

## 7.5. LIES, DAMN LIES AND STATISTICS.

The Draft Local Plan is clear on the following aspects:

- It desires to reduce car usage. The “how” is not disclosed.
- Average commuting journeys will increase in distance and time as local employment capacity fails to match population growth.
- Local road capacity (for Berkhamsted) will not be improved.
- Current population growth is putting stress on visitor capacity within the Chiltern AONB / Ashridge area. The now projected substantial growth is likely to require visitor numbers to the Chiltern AONB to be restricted.

Applying these factors to the Sustainable Transport Study commuting pattern, (2011 census base, Berkhamsted O/G ), various “what if” scenarios can be tested.

Berkhamsted Outgoing Commuting Transport

2011 Base

Scenario 1

Scenario 2

Growth on base

Bus



1.7%

X 3

X 4

Car – Driver

61.1%

Car - Passenger

3.2%

Cycle

0.9%

X 3

X 5

Train

23.5%

+ 15%

+ 20%

Walk

8.5%

+ 50%

+ 50%

Other

1.2%

Scenario 1 might be considered the target with Scenario 2 being optimistic. In reality, the (modest?!) cycle growth of Scenario 1 may have an adverse impact on the achievability of bus usage growth. However, testing the outcomes of these Scenarios, the results are as follows:

Berkhamsted Outgoing Commuting Transport

2011 Base

Scenario 1

Scenario 2

Bus

1.7%

4.1%

5.4%

Car – Driver

61.1%

57.8%

54.3%

Car – Passenger

3.2%

3.0%

2.8%

Cycle

0.9%

2.2%

3.6%

Train

23.5%

21.6%

22.6%

Walk

8.5%  
10.2  
10.2%  
Other  
1.2%  
1.1  
1.1%

100%  
100%  
100%

Based on the figures such as above, then most politicians would claim that car usage has reduced significantly and that their policy of promoting public transport, cycling and walking has been a great success.

However, because of projected population growth in the Draft Local Plan, the volume in commuting journeys of 25%+ by 2038.

Then for car related journeys the **real truth** is as follows:

	<b>Scenario 1 (optimistic?)</b>	<b>Scenario 2 (Optimistic++)</b>
Volume growth in Car Journeys	+18%	+11%

**Such growth and its impact on commuting car use cannot be accommodated within the existing road structure. The impact of such traffic volume increases, both for commuting and day-time “social, domestic and pleasure” activity within the town, cannot be absorbed without a serious reduction in the quality of life for all residents of the town – existing and new.**

7.6. Many of the “improvement” schemes developed from the Sustainable Transport Study are not site specific and not directly arising from the increase in population proposed. Mainly they are “safety measures” to benefit pedestrian and cycle movements across the town.

These “safety measures” could be implemented **NOW**, and reflect past neglect to such safety needs.

**If important they should not be timed to future new sites being developed.**

**Financial limits are not a real constraint. Why wait for s106/CIL funding? Either it is important or it is not.**

I repeat “The **Draft Local Plan** states (and plans reflect) “**will not seek to increase road capacity**”. (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer).

Yet the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan tells a different story:

- Para 18.4 states:
  - There has been a great deal of investment<sup>101</sup> undertaken in Hemel Hempstead town centre in recent years including:
  - £30m Hemel Evolution programme in Hemel Hempstead Town Centre (and £70 Million Private Investment)<sup>102</sup>
  - pedestrian shopping zone in Hemel Hempstead with a new town square, events space, lighting, landscaping and food court;
  - a new, accessible bus interchange;
  - the restoration of the Jellicoe Water Gardens.
  
- Page 130 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates the following investment needs for Hemel Hempstead:

**Table 41(a): Hemel Hempstead highways & transportation**

**Intervention**

## Estimated cost

HTP1 - East-West EWPT (Hemel Hempstead)

£58.2 - £65.8 million

HTP5 - Capacity enhancements at J8, focused on access to Maylands

£62.2-82.5 million

HTP6 - Link Road (A414 to Redbourne Road) - New spine road from B487 Rebound Road to A414 St Albans Rd - dual carriageway up to new link from M1

HTP7 - Hemel Hempstead East-West Strategic Corridor (cycle + walk)

£8.7 - £16.8 million

HTP8 - Hemel north / north-west to town centre strategic corridor (W&C, PT)

£16.2 - £26 million

HTP9 - Hemel south / south-east to town centre strategic corridor (W&C, PT)

£6.6 - £7.9 million

HTP10 - Hemel Hempstead Orbital Corridor (link road)

HTP12 - Hemel Hempstead (station) Multi-Modal Transport Interchange

£5 - £15 million

HTP13 - East Hemel (Maylands) Multi-Modal Transport Interchange

£5 - £15 million

HTP14 - Hemel Garden Communities Multi-Modal Transport Interchange

£5 - £15 million

HTP15 - Hemel Hempstead (town centre) Multi-Modal Transport Interchange

£5 - £15 million

HTP17 - Cycle improvements at Maylands

£3 - £4 million

HTP19 - Boundary Way to Wood Lane End Link Road

£800,000 - £1 million

HTP20 - A414/Greenway Lanes junction signalisation

£300,000

HHTP23 - Nickey Line improvements

£5.1 - £8.3 million

HTP29 - E-bike cycle hire

£200,000 - £600,000

- SP22 and SP22 apply to site developments in Berkhamsted and promised the same area, site and home design standards as the expansion of Hemel Hempstead, i.e. Garden City design principles. Yet the Draft Local Plan shows no real infrastructure enhancements in Berkhamsted and certainly no road capacity enhancement / no new bus services, etc, etc. The above indicates that Hemel Hempstead will be well catered for.

**The workhouse owners feasted well and long, and not a crumb remained for the orphans!**

**Yet another example of those outside Hemel Hempstead being treated as 2nd class ratepayers – but paying 1st class prices. Not acceptable.**

7.7. Continuing on this theme, neither the Transport Study (because they were not allowed to), nor the Draft Local Plan consider or suggest any road improvements, and as stated above the Draft Local Plan specifically rules out enhancing road capacity in Berkhamsted.

- Dacorum's approach is not in accord with Hertfordshire's Transport Plan (LTP4).
- Dacorum's Local Plan is not in keeping with its own attitudes in its Draft Site Sustainability Appraisals and its Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The latter saying for the Shootersway sites.

“ Development of this site would likely result in an increase in traffic to and from the site at peak hours, which would have a limited impact upon the local road network. If larger scale growth is proposed in the south west of Berkhamsted, it is likely that this would give rise to further traffic issues along Shootersway, particularly at the junction with the A416/Kings Road and the A41 junction. “

**For Darr’s Lane, wording is amplified:**

“...Development is likely to have an impact on the local road network at peak periods, including along Shootersway and Kings Road/A416. Significant improvements would likely be required, including enhancements to Darr’s Lane, Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted High Street, Shootersway, Kings Road and the A416. “

- Similar remarks are included in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (App B) that some of the sites are relatively close to bus transport:

Haslems Field = “Site is a 15-20 minute walk from the frequent 500/501 service to Watford. The 502 and 532 bus service to Hemel Hempstead is a 10 minute walk and is infrequent in comparison to the 500/501 service. “

Darr’s Lane = “Site is within walking distance to the frequent 500 bus services to both Watford and Aylesbury. Site is also within walking distance to the less frequent bus service of 532 to Hemel Hempstead.

A site of this scale has the potential to provide new/enhanced public transport connections with the existing town and wider area. “

- Sites might be 15-20 minutes walk to access the A4251 and main bus services. BUT Up-Hill on way home when tired; time then= ??
- What about on cold winter days, dark morning and dark evenings??  
Frequently no street lights – never mention on “intervention” lists
- Equally not easy for young mum with young family in tow during the daytime – particularly on bad weather days. What about infirm etc.
- Now add to above, for Darr’s Lane, that for half of the 1.2Km walk to the A4251, the route is **single-track, no street-lights, and no pathways.**



- The new sites pose serious safety issues that are not addressed in the Transport Study’s “interventions”. How can Dacorum BC in its Draft Local Plan say priority is safety of pedestrians and cyclists before cars. Then totally ignore the issues around Darr’s Lane!
- There are no “interventions” proposed for Darr’s Lane in any form, despite comments in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, (see above).
- Indeed no “Interventions” are listed for Northchurch at all, except for Lock Field which is included in housing demand.
- No suggestion of any 20mph zoning for Northchurch, (which has some of the narrowest parts of the A2541 and an air pollution area).

**DBC’s Draft Local Plan of not seeking to increase road capacity is a non-sensical approach and has to be reviewed, before any element of housing growth can be considered.**

7.8. The Draft Local Plan has another hidden agenda. Para 2.18 of the Draft Local Plan and para 5.51 of the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan state:

“Supporting the significant long-term growth at Hemel Garden Community, which as one of few flagship growth schemes supported by the County Council, will require prioritised funding. “

**Another “blank cheque” sought by Dacorum. – Well it was in the Local Plan !!**

Priority for what, when, how much, why. A real blank cheque!

Need is Need and each need should be judged on its merits – no “get out of Jail free” card.

What is proposed is :

- 
- 
- Inequitable

- **Not Acceptable.**

Another example how Dacorum considers and treats the residents of the Hemel hinterland.

It is accepted that this “prioritised” wording can be easily removed from the final version of the Local Plan. Changing the attitude of the Council Corporate is another matter.

## **1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

8.1. The Draft Local Plan (2020-2038) has several key drivers, among them (paraphrased) are:

- Meet the Government dictated housing growth targets.
- Maximise resource availability for Hemel Hempstead, and its plans for its exemplar Garden City expansion.
- With support from the County Council, encourage use of sustainable transport and penalise (by attrition) private car ownership.

All of these drivers are rejected, particularly in the way they are applied in the Draft Local Plan. The justification for the differential application or misapplication of the above principles makes a totally unbalanced forward strategy.

At strategy that would reduce the quality of life for all residents of the Borough, and out of step with the Plan objectives as stated in paras 2.13 to 2.20.

Dacorum BC stated in its response to the August 2020 White Paper: – “Communities need to see the direct benefit of accepting growth in their areas through greater investment in infrastructure provision locally.”

## **8.2 HOUSING TARGETS**

8.2.1. The Dacorum level of “approved” planning applications represents about 3 years growth in-hand based on the government forecasts or some 6 years + based on locally derived housing demand forecasts. I understand the

national figure of homes approved but not yet built total over 1 million. It does suggest the Government may be “waving the stick at the wrong dog”, in terms of where to push up the rate of house building.

Equally to apply a push factor for a short period of time to make good a short fall in housing provision, but to apply over an 18 year Local Plan period totally distorts logical community planning.

Clashes on (Government) policies are not unexpected – in this case minimising intrusion into the Green Belt and meeting local housing need.

In such instances the clash has to be tested to determine the balance of need.

**This has not been demonstrated.**

**Exceptional circumstances have to be demonstrated and evidenced to justify encroachment into the Green Belt.**

8.2.2. Local housing forecast, circa 400 houses per annum, although numerically would not require any Green Belt land viewed from a borough wide perspective, some minor Green Belt take would be required to meet the needs on a per community basis, vis Berkhamsted and Tring.

However, to apply Government forecasts, vis 922 homes per annum would produce the Draft Local Plan as presented, with particular impact falling to Berkhamsted and Tring, vis:

The impact of the Government's forecast is to add 7,500 to 9,300 houses to the Borough plan, of which **6,000 homes** would be in the Green Belt.

This demand, viewed in terms of land usage gives rise to the following:

<b>Use</b>	<b>Hectares (Green Belt)</b>
Homes	493 All Government driven – not locally justified.
Employ't	<u>92</u>
	585

8.2.3. The Government housing target is not supportable and has not been subject to valid "Exceptional Circumstances" evaluation

- **The imposed housing targets are therefore unacceptable and take no meaningful account of actual need.**
- **The "exceptional circumstances" for 81% of growth to be met by encroachments into the Green Belt has not been shown and justified.**
- **The proposals for Berkhamsted and Tring that about 90% of homes are on new sites in the Green Belt are not acceptable.**

### 8.3. OTHER HOUSING / SITE SELECTION ISSUES

The Draft Local Plan, as presented, is deficit in several areas which can be exemplified by again citing Dacorum' response to the White Paper on planning, vis "Communities need to see the direct benefit of accepting growth in their areas through greater investment in infrastructure provision locally."

The Plan as presented only assures reductions in living standards for all residents. This is not acceptable, and no amelioration proposals are offered – **so the Local Plan is rejected.**

- 1 Dacorum's Sustainability Assessment methodology appears flawed in construction; even on the standards applied none of the Berkhamsted sites pass "sustainability".
- 2 The sites fail in terms of meeting Dacorum's own Plan policies.
- 3 Infrastructure elements to absorb the potential population increases are unclear. [Gossoms End surgery already has parking problems for both the surgery and local residents; in 2021, two additional surgeries will move onto the site. Neither the Health Authority nor the Borough Council have tabled car parking improvements].
- 4 No real attempt, or acceptance of responsibility, to seek solution to sustainable public transport provision to the new sites proposed for Berkhamsted.
- 5 The local plan does not indicate how existing community assets and facilities, e.g. Green Areas, Open Spaces, Sportscentre, will be maintained and not overwhelmed by the growth proposed.
- 6 Site design proposals, (SPD's) have not been developed, so this public consultation cannot assess the merits of the sites proposed. In the case of the "Shootersway" sites, embracing 7 locations / developers a "community" wide SPD might be desirable to avoid 7 different developer led sub optimal community outcomes.
- 7 Bk06 and Bk08 due to location and lackings in terms of road /pathway/access/ public transport may give rise to social isolation issues. The Plan does not recognise the risk of such issues.
- 8 Lock Field, (Bk07) should be delisted. It is unsuitable for development.

### 8.4. TRANSPORT:

It is difficult to know where to start regarding the shortcomings on the Transport elements of the Draft Local Plan in relation to Berkhamsted.

The Draft Local Plan policy DM 50 is breached in every element in regard to the “Transport and Movement” proposals outlined for Berkhamsted. Equally each of the sites in “west” Berkhamsted cannot meet policy DM52.

Basis for rejecting the Transport proposals as applied to Berkhamsted, include:

- The County Council’s LTP4 strategy is being misapplied in the Draft Local Plan in not recognising the “**Dispersed**” nature of the housing developments proposed that will increase dependency on the private car.
- The County Council LTP4 recognises that the increase in car dependency will be in the order of **+25%** :
  - Requiring highway upgrades and improvements.
  - Have implications for quality of life, human health, the environment and energy consumption.
  - This situation is echoed in Dacorum’s Transport Study and Site Sustainability Appraisals vis: “Many roads already experience significant levels of traffic congestion and this can have negative implications on surrounding . . . . . If congestion levels continue to increase, this may force people to find alternative and less suitable routes which can have negative impacts . . . . . on communities. “
- The Draft Local Plan has no proposals for improving public sustainable transport modes, thus facilitating the option for reducing dependency on use of the private car.
- The plan is not consistent on proposing “interventions” to improve road safety.
- Most of the proposed “interventions” are for “safety” reasons; improving the safety of pedestrians and cyclists from the irresponsible people who drive cars! As such this need exists now and except for the level of need has nothing to do with when the new homes might be delivered. Why, if needed for safety, do we have to wait for S106 / CIL funding?
- The Sustainable Transport Study was restricted in relation to the types of transport/road improvements that could be examined / recommended. Also, significant areas (roads and needs) were not included in the Transport Study.

**This is not being open and honest. Little choice is no choice.**
- The Draft Plan proposes: “**will not seek to increase road capacity**”. (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer).
  - Population growth will exceed employment capacity – more away journeys to find work.
  - The dispersed location and nature of the housing development sites invoke “first mile /last mile” making car use the easiest choice in many cases.

- Net result = more car journeys, significantly more commuting journeys (+25%) if the proposed level of home build is proceeded with.
- Seeking reduction in car usage by attrition, rather than by persuasion / education is not acceptable as it adversely affects all residents.
- The approach of not seeking to increase road capacity will increase the frequency of road congestion incidents and increase the severity of congestion.
  - This will impact on the quality of life for all.
  - This will reduce road safety – Catch 22?
  - Congestion / longer journey times will disrupt bus timetables; less bus reliability equals less passengers. Catch 22?
  - All of above are non-acceptable impacts and do not fit with Dacorum’s statement – “**Communities need to see the direct benefit of accepting growth in their areas through greater investment in infrastructure provision locally.**”
- The Draft Local Plan promises new homes in Berkhamsted will apply the Hemel Hempstead “Garden City” standards. Can we also have equality in spend levels on transport interchanges / pedestrian + cycleways +public transport / new road provisions?
- The Transport Study seems to have been confused as to the scope and area to be included within the “Berkhamsted” study. From a new home sites point of view Northchurch was included in the “Berkhamsted envelope”. Remarks re population at paras 1.2. and para 8.2, cite 20,500 – a figure which balances with the 2011 census results /stats used throughout the report.
  - However para 3.2 cites population as being 18,600 – 2018 figure. This accords with Northchurch being excluded.
  - Northchurch seems to have been ignored throughout the Transport report:
    - No interventions are proposed for Northchurch.
    - Seems strange as Northchurch is northern (A4251) entry/exit point to the town of Berkhamstead.
    - The studies road analysis ignores key roads of Darr’s Lane, New Road, Granville Road and High Street South.
    - The fact that Northchurch will provide new sites providing **25%** of the new homes growth for “Berkhamsted”.

- Added to the above the Transport Study consultants had several phases of “Shareholder Engagement” – see paras 2.31 and 5.3 – culminating in a workshop on 20 May 2020. These engagements included:
  - Dacorum Borough Council & Herts County Council
  - Berkhamsted & Tring Town Councils.
  - Local Bus and Train operators
  - the land owners/promoters of the key development sites coming forward.
  - The National Trust.
- Where was the involvement of Northchurch Parish Council?

Recent Government and car industry announcements, (e.g. production of petrol/diesel vehicles to cease by 2030), will significantly increase the roll-out rate of private electric/ULE vehicles.

Electric / ULEV are classified as Sustainable Transport, (in this Local Plan and NPPF definitions). So, as Electric / ULEV private cars will be in the majority during the timeframe of this Local Plan period the Local Plan and policies towards private vehicle usage needs to be moderated.

**The transport attitudes espoused in the Draft Local Plan need to be reviewed and rebalanced.**

Attached:

Appendix 1 = New Road, Bell Lane and part Shootersway

Appendix 2 = Darr’s Lane

Appendix 3 = Granville Road

Appendix 4 = A4251 / High Street, Northchurch

Appendix 5 = Charles Street / Shrublands Road.

**Included files**

[Russ James - Backup-App1.pdf](#)  
[russ James - Backup-App2.pdf](#)



[Russ James - Backup-App3.pdf](#)  
[Russ James - Backup-App4.pdf](#)  
[Russ James - Backup-App5.pdf](#)

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12702
<b>Person ID</b>	1264257
<b>Full Name</b>	Pam Beeby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There's only one central east/west road through town and one north/south crossing and the traffic lights there are already a problem. An increase in vehicle traffic would lead to gridlock increasing pollution and pedestrian hazards and the geographical position of the town, being in a valley, does not give any opportunity to alleviate this by the provision of new roads. Many of the houses in the central areas of Berkhamsted do not have off-road parking and are already congested with parked cars. It is already difficult for emergency services, refuse collection etc to access these areas and an addition of 2200 new homes can only make this much worse.</p> <p>As there is no increase to the employment areas of the town it is likely that such a large increase in new housing would be occupied by commuters which again increases car use.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12707
<b>Person ID</b>	1269600
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12710
<b>Person ID</b>	1269600
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub.</li> </ul> <p>Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence</p> <p>and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two</li> </ul>

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12721
<b>Person ID</b>	396113
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Hopkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring</p> <p>The plan refers to the distinctiveness of towns, but does not indicate what features are perceived to actually make each town distinctive.</p>

Tring is very close to the Buckinghamshire border. Have planners taken into consideration the large number houses and other facilities e.g. warehousing, being built nearby? Also the redevelopment of Halton due to take place in the future. If one includes these developments within a few miles, this area is becoming very overdeveloped.

The main difficulty with the plan is that the number of homes planned for Tring is disproportionately large compared with the rest of Dacorum. This will incur loss of Green Belt and the homes will impinge on the AONB. There will also be problems in that the development will overwhelm existing infrastructure. New roads will not solve the problem.

I would prefer to see more houses built around the Bulbourne area. This would have a reduced effect on the AONB. There are already commercial buildings there, a new supermarket could be built which would serve that side of Tring and also the villages north of Tring. It would be better than putting a new supermarket in the centre of Tring and eliminating the working farms in the Dunsley area, which would create more traffic congestion in the centre of town. There is a proposal of warehousing on the Dunsley site which would make a very unattractive entrance to the town. The Bulbourne area has access to the M1 and Tring Station without having to go through Tring.

The COVID pandemic has accelerated changes which were already taking place, such as; working from home and the reduction in retail space required with more of us making purchases on line. More people than ever are enjoying the countryside. Does the plan have the capacity to be flexible enough to meet changing trends?

To avoid the town centre and car parks becoming congested, public transport would be required between the station and around the new development areas. Clearer detail is needed on how this would be managed.

More detail is required on how the loss of habitat will be mitigated. No mention is made of retention of hedgrows etc. Wildlife corridors should be clearly defined and adequate to the purpose. (A cricket pitch might be green, but it is not a wildlife corridor.)

The plan should state that houses will be built to a very high standard of energy efficiency, and include provision for installation of renewable energy (e.g. solar panels), in order to meet Dacorum's stated aim of being zero carbon by 2030.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12762

**Person ID** 1146108

**Full Name** Mr Alex Taylor

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>We would like to add the following points:</p> <p><b>1)</b> Sustainable development is defined as that which can be done again and again until the end of time without increasing damage being done. Anything that cannot say this is, by definition, unsustainable. Anything that builds on the limited resource that is green, undeveloped land, is clearly unsustainable as the land will eventually run out.</p> <p>We agree that more dwellings need to be built, but the only sustainable way to do this is to build on previously-developed land and find ways to improve on density. Any ingress into the countryside, no matter how gradual, is unsustainable as the end result is no countryside.</p> <p><b>2)</b> The area between London Road and Bank Mill Lane that is proposed as a development site is a uniquely beautiful and precious landscape for animals. It forms the boundary of Berkhamsted at present and, despite the landowners best attempts to destroy it, has a variety of habitats that make it incredibly precious.</p> <p>Herons, Falcons, Kites, Newts, Badgers and Bats all make this their home, whether in the pools at the south-western corners, or in the barns. It is staggeringly beautiful and would be a great loss to the community and cause a terrible loss of habitats.</p> <p>It will also have a hugely negative impact on the protected area that is the first thing people see when they arrive in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I enclose a few photos of the area which is proposed to be built on. This is not like building homes on a former factory site.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Alex and Naomi Taylor - all pictures v1.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12764
<b>Person ID</b>	1269619
<b>Full Name</b>	Naomi Taylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>We would like to add the following points:</p> <p><b>1)</b> Sustainable development is defined as that which can be done again and again until the end of time without increasing damage being done. Anything that cannot say this is, by definition, unsustainable. Anything that builds on the limited resource that is green, undeveloped land, is clearly unsustainable as the land will eventually run out.</p> <p>We agree that more dwellings need to be built, but the only sustainable way to do this is to build on previously-developed land and find ways to improve on density. Any ingress into the countryside, no matter how gradual, is unsustainable as the end result is no countryside.</p> <p><b>2)</b> The area between London Road and Bank Mill Lane that is proposed as a development site is a uniquely beautiful and precious landscape for animals. It forms the boundary of Berkhamsted at present and, despite the landowners best attempts to destroy it, has a variety of habitats that make it incredibly precious.</p> <p>Herons, Falcons, Kites, Newts, Badgers and Bats all make this their home, whether in the pools at the south-western corners, or in the barns. It is staggeringly beautiful and would be a great loss to the community and cause a terrible loss of habitats.</p> <p>It will also have a hugely negative impact on the protected area that is the first thing people see when they arrive in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I enclose a few photos of the area which is proposed to be built on. This is not like building homes on a former factory site.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Alex and Naomi Taylor - all pictures v1.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12799
<b>Person ID</b>	1269633
<b>Full Name</b>	Patrick Sherwen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to add my voice to that of the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG), in objection to the Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038).</p> <p>I enclose BRAG's full response, attached to this email.</p> <p>However, in addition I would like to say that I understand there is a need for additional housing in this country, particularly of an affordable nature. This does not justify needless, irreversible damage to green belt land, in contradiction to government policy and the wishes of local residents, when there are preferable alternatives in the local area.</p> <p>Where the decision to override the policies that are rightly in place to protect the natural environment in an area of great beauty, in a way that would be irrecoverable, is made for purely commercial reasons, it cannot be supported. Only as a very last resort should this be considered and it seems clear that this is not the case here.</p> <p>Simply because plans of this kind have been couched in positive language, about sustainability and economic growth, does not change the nature of what is proposed.</p> <p>Please do not underestimate the importance and value of the beautiful greenbelt countryside around Berkhamsted. It is loved and appreciated by all who live here and who would choose to live here, and is an asset shared by the residents of many towns in this area. As officers charged with the responsibility to safeguard the wellbeing of local people and the town and its local environment, it is your duty to reject any schemes that do not prioritise the protection of something that once taken away, can never be returned, to the cost of us all, when better alternatives are available to achieve similar objectives.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">BRAG-2021-submission-to-DBC-Local-Plan-Consultation-FINAL.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12814
<b>Person ID</b>	1269634
<b>Full Name</b>	Frank Worth

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	— Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12817
<b>Person ID</b>	1269634
<b>Full Name</b>	Frank Worth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	— Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.



— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12845
<b>Person ID</b>	1145801
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Guy Barlow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The topography of Berkhamsted, being in a valley does not lend itself to be able to cope with the proposed scale of development being proposed for the town in the plan as access into the town centre will only increase and this is already congested.

The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.

This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.

The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.

The flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

Taking away Green Belt robs the community of an important health resource and farm land that contributes food supply stability.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12860

**Person ID** 1269653

**Full Name** Tony Dowle

**Organisation Details** Director  
Rathbawn Properties Ltd

**Agent ID** 1269652

**Agent Full Name** Miss  
Lucy  
Morris

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Development is directed towards the south and west of Berkhamsted with the A41 acting as a strong and permanent barrier to the Green Belt and open countryside to the south. The north of Berkhamsted has no such strong barriers. It is agreed that this is a logical location for development and reflects paragraph 136 of the NPPF and the need to establish permanent boundaries to the Green Belt.</p> <p>To the west of Berkhamsted, three “Growth Areas” are identified which total approximately 480 dwellings. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BK05: Blegberry Gardens – 80 dwellings;</li> <li>• BK06: East of Darrs Lane – 200 dwellings; and</li> <li>• BK08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41) – 200</li> </ul> <p>Together, these three sites form a west of Berkhamsted “extension” which only reaches as far west as Darr’s Lane. As set out above, the A41 acts as a strong and permanent barrier to the open countryside to the south. Development on the south side of the A4251 extends as far west as Pea Lane, indicating that an extension could also extend this far without compromising the gap to Tring.</p> <p>In omitting virtually all AONB sites at the outset from its site selection process, the Council has ignored a logical area for a further sustainable extension to Berkhamsted which reflects sustainable patterns of development and will assist in achieving its housing requirement.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12884
<b>Person ID</b>	1269665
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Hicks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy. Where is the SANG referred to in 23.134 proposed for? This is one of several referred to in the plan but with little if any justification, detail, location etc. This approach to SANG provision is inconsistent and

potentially undeliverable. Without further information, the plan is unsustainable in respect of SANGS achieving their apparent objectives.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12924

**Person ID** 1269668

**Full Name** Sally Chrispin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Specifically as regards the proposed developments in Berkhamsted and Northchurch

- 1 The proposals fail to address the landscape and infrastructure of Berkhamsted and Northchurch as essentially valley towns with steep sides and narrow roads. Most of the proposed sites (including sheltered, affordable and disabled housing) are at the top of steep hills at the top of narrow roads. The traffic in the area is already congested, particularly if the A41 is closed and as walking will not be an easy option for some with the sites where they are at the top of the hill, the roads will be busier still.
- 2 Berkhamsted and Northchurch generally have narrow roads and pavements weren't built for the now often 2 car family and very little has been done to address this in the area, with parking on the already small pavements the norm putting even more strain on the infrastructure. A substantial increase in traffic in the area can only make this worse.
- 3 As a resident of Northchurch I am particularly disturbed by the level of proposed builds in the area. St Marys School and Westfield school are situated near or on busy narrow roads which are congested and will be more so if the proposed builds are extended at Durrants lane/Darrs Lane and Lock Field/New Road. The sites on and near Lock Field/New Road particularly will need to access the main road over a single track canal bridge and past St Marys school which have narrow pavements. The cars regularly speed in the area and any additional housing in the area will only increase the likelihood of damage to the bridge; heavy congestion, pollution and danger to the school children.

- 4 Northchurch is its own community and the level of build proposed in this area risks the town losing that identity and being subsumed within Berkhamsted – the plan in fact does not even mention Northchurch.
- 5 I have a beautiful view across the valley and towards the Lock Field site and love watching the changing scenery throughout the year from my bedroom window. This view would be lost if the proposal to build here was passed. I also enjoy walking, in particular during these trying times, and it has been a source of great comfort to me to be able to walk from my house in Northchurch and access several different areas of natural scenery, each with their own beauty and environment. The proposals in Northchurch in particular seems to be disproportionate to the other areas and sees most of these areas being built on or views excluded due to additional housing.
- 6 With the increase in housing proposed there is no additional sport facility included in the plan. The town is already struggling for cricket, hockey and football pitches and increased houses will reduce availability even more.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12970

**Person ID** 1264971

**Full Name** Louise Watson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12973

**Person ID** 1264971

**Full Name** Louise Watson

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12974
<b>Person ID</b>	1264971
<b>Full Name</b>	Louise Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by people absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p>

There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

The increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12975

**Person ID** 1264971

**Full Name** Louise Watson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06: this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator devise is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of BK08 – Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13008
<b>Person ID</b>	330928
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr James Gregory
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Building in such concentration around Shootersway area and it's junction with Kingshill/Kingshill Way is irresponsible. Shootersway is located on the ridge of a long hill with 5% inclines which creates a major water supply and sewerage



management problem. Water run off in inclement weather from the new buildings/civil works will create a bigger water run off hazard affecting the already existing problem of flooding down the hill. Traffic is already a problem in this area; increased housing will add to the hazard and exacerbate the danger to young children who have to use the single width pavement or no pavement to access the only state secondary school in the town. The environment is already impacted as many parents drive their children a short distance to the school to avoid them having to navigate this area.

Shootersway does not lend itself to expansion to overcome the current transport difficulties so how is it to overcome them with the increasing housing? Residents will find it even harder to access the amenities in the town e.g. the railway.

Many of the new houses will be built along the A41 corridor in the very places originally designated for woodland growth to overcome the pollution from the motorway. People living in the are will be exposed to the identified pollution areas shown in the original motorway plans.

Meeting the new (and unrealistic) target will lose irreplaceable green belt land and damage this area already designated as AONB

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13031

**Person ID** 1270011

**Full Name** Mrs Nicola Davis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** There is little room to expand the road system in the valley, so traffic congestion would become a massive issue in the town. Our water & disposal would be affected negatively; there isn't the infrastructure or space for the infrastructure to support these proposals. The environmental impact will be huge.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS13033
<b>Person ID</b>	1270011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Nicola Davis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Why do the plans priorities building on Greenbelt land and not on brownfield sites? The positioning of these sites mean that new residents will be forced to use their cars to travel into town, again adversely affecting the town congestion issues. We have streets through Berkhamsted which have cars parked on both sides of the roads, and on pavements. The proposed sites will increase pollution, traffic noise and be hazardous to pedestrians.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13034
<b>Person ID</b>	1270011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Nicola Davis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Greenbelt land that will be destroyed play a massive environmental role. They act as the lung of Berkhamsted, providing a barrier between the A41 and residential housing, so all the trees and grasses lock in CO2 emissions. The new homes will be built close to the busy dual carriageway, with new residents / families exposed to higher levels of pollution.

We are constrained by being within a valley, with little opportunity for new roads & infrastructure. The town can be access from many of the new sites via narrow lanes that are single track in places.

There needs to be provision for enough safe space for walking, cycling and public transport into town.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13056

**Person ID** 1270013

**Full Name** Mr Daniel Ritchie

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two

towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13100

**Person ID** 1270037

**Full Name** MRS GINA BARLOW

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The topography of Berkhamsted, being in a valley does not lend itself to be able to cope with the proposed scale of development being proposed for the town in the plan as access into the town centre will only increase and this is already heavily congested.

The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.

This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.

The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.

What's more the current railway transport system is not fit for purpose, there is very limited parking, platforms and train when they arrive, at their absolute limits.

The flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical.

The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

Taking away Green Belt robs the community of an important health resource and farm land that contributes food supply stability.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13106

**Person ID** 1270038

**Full Name** LOU COLLINS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
**\* Yes**

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a long-standing resident of Berkhamsted, I ask that my response to the current proposals for housing development here and in the wider Dacorum Borough, as contained in the current Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038), be recorded and taken into account in your published consultation findings.

I wish to register a very strong objection to the proposals as currently set out.

I have read the consultation documents thoroughly. I have also read, and would wish to fully endorse the consultation responses provided to you by Berkhamsted Citizens Association and Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG). As set out in considerable detail in those responses, I have some very significant concerns generally and also specifically that I would like to highlight for my home town of Berkhamsted. These can be identified as follows:

1. Over-estimate of need generally. In the first instance, I believe that Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) has inappropriately adopted the government standard calculation of housing need as a mandatory target (which it is not) and in doing so has very significantly over-estimated future need for housing in the borough. This undermines the entire basis for the proposals presented.

Proposals for excessively high numbers of additional dwellings for this area simply cannot be justified. The very latest (ONS 2018) full projections for housing need in Dacorum are calculated to be in the region of 355 dwellings per annum (dpa). Even adjusting by MHCLG's standard algorithm (to 497dpa), the projected housing need in Dacorum is very close to the figure of 430dpa that is already contained (and is being fulfilled – and indeed being over-fulfilled for Berkhamsted) within the existing Local Plan. Those projections (either 355dpa or 497dpa) are however, both dramatically lower than the figure you use of 922dpa, or worse still, 1,023dpa (using the now very outdated, 2014 ONS data).

While it is clear that the demand for genuinely affordable and social housing remains unmet in the whole country, all other trend evidence is of a marked and sustained decline in housing need, as indeed is that of the ONS. Further, many official sources have yet to formally incorporate the decline in population that has resulted from Covid-19 and Brexit; decline which saw over 1m (EU and non-EU born) immigrants alone leave the UK in just the first 9 months of 2020 (according to The Migration Observatory). Also, In terms of distribution of housing need and availability of additional brownfield and infill sites nationwide, these data are yet to factor-in the priorities associated with the government's stated 'levelling up' agenda, or the inevitable fallout of Covid-19 that has led Ministers to call for a 're-imagining of our town and city centres to vibrant living spaces that are created where commerce and light industry once stood'.

There is not a single current piece of trend data for housing need that supports anything like the scale of development presented by DBC; indeed all the evidence shows a disparity that would only be set to widen during the life of the Local Plan. DBC must therefore reject the figures established by MHCLG, replacing them instead with data which they can show to be evidence-based, current, and which demonstrates the realistic falling trend over the life of the plan, for general housing need in Dacorum.

2. No demonstrable justification for the impact on Green Belt. In addition to providing for significantly more homes than can be justified by projected need, the plan proposes the unnecessary and irreversible release of c2,000 acres of Green Belt. In my own town of Berkhamsted, 80% of the proposed new dwellings would be on Green Belt land. That land clearly meets the definition to be afforded protection in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and is supported by the government's ongoing, publicly stated, commitments to protect Green Belt and AONB, consistently reflected in

ministerial statements like that of Brandon Lewis (then Minister of MHCLG) when he went on record to say that “demand for housing alone will not change Green Belt boundaries”. As these proposals will demonstratively not have local support and as they fail (despite assertions in the consultation to the contrary) in any other way to robustly justify, the very high ‘exceptional circumstances’ threshold that is required to reclassify Green Belt, they must be rejected. The point made previously about the need to properly plan for homes on new emerging brownfield and infill sites in our town centres, also needs to take priority over any proposal to build anew on Green Belt.

3. Building targets for Berkhamsted are unsustainable. The proposal to deliver 2,236 in Berkhamsted and Northchurch alone (equating to a staggering increase of 24% more dwellings and 31% growth in urban footprint), most of which is on valley ridge Green Belt land, is the exact opposite of the ‘sustainable development’ that is said to be aimed for by DBC and that we would all like to see. An increase on that scale would simply overwhelm the identity of historic Berkhamsted. Also, as was successfully argued in the previous Local Plan consultation, it would lead to insurmountable issues with traffic congestion, resident capacity, road flooding, domestic water availability and sewage (all of which are already at capacity) – before even embarking on concerns for the delivery of additional essential services (e.g. schools, GPs/dentists and public transport) and for resident wellbeing (such as access to local jobs, shops, leisure facilities, green space and places to walk and cycle).

All but a handful of infill sites for Berkhamsted are beyond the current edge of town, high on the steep valley ridges, making them inaccessible to vital services (including shops and the railway station) sited in the valley-floor town centre, other than by car. Berkhamsted already suffers with traffic congestion and simply cannot cope – or be accommodated to manage safely - with any more traffic. That is evident daily but particularly every time there is an accident locally on the A41; such accidents are sadly relatively frequent and always lead to a log-jam of cars along the High Street that lasts for hours. Even recent short-term utilities works, that resulted in replacement traffic lights at the British Film Institute on Kings Road, led to long traffic jams every morning and evening, with stationary cars backing up beyond the cemetery and even (dangerously) onto the A41. This demonstrated the reality of just the slightest increase in pressure on our already creaking road system.

It must also be a concern that although well maintained, already the London Road and High Street routinely suffer overwhelmed gutters in heavy rainfall. With the land beyond the London Road (by Bank Mill and where further housing is planned) already designated flood plain, it is reasonable to expect that rain would become a significant weather hazard for the town were we to lose the elevated open fields that currently play such a critical role in absorbing rainfall and avoiding even more significant valley side runoff. Filling those fields with the foundations of many hundreds of new houses – as proposed - would exacerbate the problem even further. It would also, of course, lead to a reduction in what is highly productive arable land in our locality.

Another very significant issue for the ‘sustainability’ aims of the proposals relates to affordability of housing in Berkhamsted. While it may help developers’ profits, and DBC to realise considerable rates revenues, with the average house price in Berkhamsted estimated by all reliable sources (for February 2021) at well over £700,000, there would be absolutely no prospect of the ‘affordability threshold’ (of a third of income) being attainable by any but the most wealthy. Buyers would not be local families. Attracting incomes on the necessary scale, they would inevitably be relocating from London (as is already the trend), adding to capacity issues (for doctors, dentists, schools, open space, etc) and also requiring commuting

facilities, again compounding the already overwhelmed local roads and trains. That is simply not sustainable on the scale suggested in the proposals.

Finally, may I remind the Council that these proposals are completely at odds with the position of the government and our local MP, calling as they do for reclassification of huge areas of Green Belt in this constituency, to deliver houses that cannot be justified by current evidence of projected need. In this regard, I agree with our MP's stated aim of ensuring that "At a local level, we must as a community come together and agree a way to sustainably ensure new homes are built for local residents." I would add to that, that such homes must be genuinely affordable and include social housing provision. That is not what the current proposals for a new Local Plan, as set out in this consultation, would deliver.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13110

**Person ID** 1264860

**Full Name** Alan Coughtrey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Berkhamsted & Tring Developments  
 The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13116

**Person ID** 1264860

**Full Name** Alan Coughtrey

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.</p> <p>This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.</p> <p>The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.</p> <p>This is already causing damage to Berkhamsted Conservation area. Cross Oak Road has already become a cut-through from the west of the town to the A41 -- this contrary to the planning constraints adopted when the new A41 bypass was constructed. Cross Oak Road and other south-north roads are already suffering from heavy traffic generated by new housing (notable Bearroc Park) on the south side of the town wanting to access schools on the north side of the town and to the town centre.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13117
<b>Person ID</b>	1264860
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Large developments on the south side of the town inevitably turn the town into a car focused dormitory rather than encouraging railway and green transport hub.</p> <p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns us about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death.</p> <p>Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13118
<b>Person ID</b>	1264860
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13120
<b>Person ID</b>	1264860
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Some concerns include Increased Flood Risk Again because Berkhamsted is situated in a valley during heavy rain and storms the drainage infrastructure often cannot cope. I have seen the road outside my house on many occasions turn into a small river, the tarmac has been lifted and even main drains burst. Anything that reduces the ability of the land to drain and hold water at the top of the hills should be rejected. These sites are situated at valley tops and would lead to more water runoff effecting those lower down the hills.  Development on previously open fields at the top of the valley might well lead to destructive and costly flooding in the middle of the town just as it has in Chesham.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13126
<b>Person ID</b>	1270061
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted & Tring Developments The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13132
<b>Person ID</b>	1270061
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Berkhamsted developments are mainly at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, new residents will need to use private vehicles to travel into town and connect with public transport like at the train station. The proposals in

these locations are for family homes. It is not practical or realistic to expect children or less mobile residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments.

This is even-more true considering that the routes into town and to the railway station are through lanes and narrow residential roads with on-street parking. It is not uncommon for cars to be parked on both pavements leaving just a single car width of road for all parties to fight and use.

The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution, traffic noise and hazards to pedestrians.

This is already causing damage to Berkhamsted Conservation area. Cross Oak Road has already become a cut-through from the west of the town to the A41 -- this contrary to the planning constraints adopted when the new A41 bypass was constructed. Cross Oak Road and other south-north roads are already suffering from heavy traffic generated by new housing (notable Bearroc Park) on the south side of the town wanting to access schools on the north side of the town and to the town centre.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13133

**Person ID** 1270061

**Full Name** Mrs Coughtrey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Large developments on the south side of the town inevitably turn the town into a car focused dormitory rather than encouraging railway and green transport hub.

In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.

What concerns us about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.

Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death.

Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.

Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13134

**Person ID** 1270061

**Full Name** Mrs Coughtrey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13136
<b>Person ID</b>	1270061
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Some concerns include Increased Flood Risk</p> <p>Again because Berkhamsted is situated in a valley during heavy rain and storms the drainage infrastructure often cannot cope. I have seen the road outside my house on many occasions turn into a small river, the tarmac has been lifted and even main drains burst. Anything that reduces the ability of the land to drain and hold water at the top of the hills should be rejected. These sites are situated at valley tops and would lead to more water runoff effecting those lower down the hills.</p> <p>Development on previously open fields at the top of the valley might well lead to destructive and costly flooding in the middle of the town just as it has in Chesham.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13164
<b>Person ID</b>	1270069
<b>Full Name</b>	Patrick Moloney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13167
<b>Person ID</b>	1270069
<b>Full Name</b>	Patrick Moloney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</li> <li>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</li> <li>There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</li> </ul>



- Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.
- There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.
- This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13178

**Person ID** 1144725

**Full Name** Mr Philip Anderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS13181
<b>Person ID</b>	1144725
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Philip Anderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</li> <li>• The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</li> <li>• There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</li> <li>• Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</li> <li>• There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</li> </ul>

- This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13197

**Person ID** 1270127

**Full Name** Amy Moloney

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13200

**Person ID** 1270127

**Full Name** Amy Moloney

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</li> <li>• The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</li> <li>• There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</li> <li>• Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</li> <li>• There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13219
<b>Person ID</b>	1270128
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Salway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13273
<b>Person ID</b>	1270154
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Alison Purdy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The sites do not meet sustainability assessment requirements as set by Dacorum BC. The sites conflict with Dacorum's own plan policies.</p> <p>Bk07 – Lock Field – shown be delisted. It is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The infrastructure demands to absorb this population growth have been ignored.</p> <p>Site design proposals (SPD's) have not been drafted, so no details what proposed in depth for each site'</p> <p>Have not considered that "Shootersway" be considered as one overall neighbourhood "community" development – not 7 separate, non-contiguous sites, where separate developer objectives would deliver sub optimal social outcomes.</p>

That the plan to date has insufficiently covered the social isolation impacts of these sites, in particular sites Bk06 and Bk08, and how these sites can best be fully absorbed into the community.

No real attempt, or acceptance of commitments, to finding supporting transport solutions for these new, dispersed sites has been forthcoming, e.g. bus services.

As presented the Draft Local Plan does not address for the existing population how their existing social assets and facilities will be maintained and not overwhelmed.

How, as far as is practical, will existing quality of life standards be protected, maintained, and where shortfalls currently exist that they would be addressed. will not seek to increase road capacity". (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer)

Attrition against car uses, by resisting road improvement and adding to congestion, makes life difficult for everyone. More congestion, traffic delays, parking problems will impact by default on all - pedestrians, cyclists, bus users, commercial road users et al.

The Draft Local Plan is likely to create a "Catch 22". Wasting resources by tinkering at edge and not addressing crux of the problems,

More car usage is unavoidable, if population / housing is to be expanded. Not expanding and remodelling road infrastructure are not an acceptable alternative. Dacorum's approach is not in accord with Hertfordshire's Transport Plan (LTP4).

Dacorum's Local Plan is not in keeping with its own attitudes in its Draft Site Sustainability Appraisals and its Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The latter saying for the Shootersway sites.

" Development of this site would likely result in an increase in traffic to and from the site at peak hours, which would have a limited impact upon the local road network. If larger scale growth is proposed in the south west of Berkhamsted, it is likely that this would give rise to further traffic issues along Shootersway, particularly at the junction with the A416/Kings Road and the A41 junction. "

For Darr's Lane, wording is amplified:

“...Development is likely to have an impact on the local road network at peak periods, including along Shootersway and Kings Road/A416. Significant improvements would likely be required, including enhancements to Darr’s Lane, Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted High Street, Shootersway, Kings Road and the A416. “

Similar remarks are included in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (App B) that some of the sites are relatively close to bus transport :

Haslems Field = “Site is a 15-20 minute walk from the frequent 500/501 service to Watford. The 502 and 532 bus service to Hemel Hempstead is a 10 minute walk and is infrequent in comparison to the 500/501 service. “

Darr’s Lane = “Site is within walking distance to the frequent 500 bus services to both Watford and Aylesbury. Site is also within walking distance to the less frequent bus service of 532 to Hemel Hempstead.

A site of this scale has the potential to provide new/enhanced public transport connections with the existing town and wider area. “

Sites might be 15-20 minutes walk to access the A4251 and main bus services. BUT Up-hill on way home tired, then time = ??

What about on cold winter days, dark morning and dark evenings??

Equally not easy for young mum with young family in tow during the daytime – particularly on bad weather days. What about infirm etc. Now add to above, for Darr’s Lane, that for half of the 1.2Km walk to the A4251, the route is single-track, no street-lights, and no pathways.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13297

**Person ID** 1270180

**Full Name** Brian and Susan Hunt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We would like to register our opposition to the proposed local plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The housing needs for this area were based on a flawed algorithm</li> <li>2) The scale of the proposed development would completely overwhelm Berkhamsted's facilities and the traffic flow generated would cause gridlock and pollution in the High Street.</li> <li>3) The bulk of the development to the south of Berkhamsted would be on productive farmland.</li> <li>4) The loss of this beautiful open area, wildlife corridors and increased pollution would be to the detriment of citizens of Berkhamsted.</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion, a number of assumptions made in the plan are clearly flawed e.g. Retail development on estates have never worked, shop units on Ashlyns Estate were never let and became housing, not many of the shops on Durrants Estate survive, all the traffic will be sucked into the High Street. The plan acknowledges that it is difficult to provide bus services but goes onto to say alternative modes of transport will need to be found. What will these be?</p> <p>Finally, we didn't see any mention of the new main sewer that will be needed or the upgrades to electricity supply.</p> <p>We trust you will take our views into account.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13298
<b>Person ID</b>	1270181
<b>Full Name</b>	Diana Blass
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I live at [ADDRESS REDACTED] and have only recently become aware of the proposed developments, in particular the one at Shootersway and Darrs Lane.</p> <p>1.I was shocked to learn that there will potentially be a development on Greenbelt land in an area of natural beauty. To use this land where there are other brown field sites that could be used is unthinkable.</p> <p>2.I question why this plan appears to have been rushed through at a time of lockdown and pandemic when information has not been able to be shared in particular with the large number of elderly residents in Northchurch who have no access to technology. No local meetings have been held except for a few zoom calls so the residents have been unable to fully voice their concerns.</p> <p>3.You claim to be protecting the environment, I strongly disagree with this statement when you intend to build a secondary school less than 2 miles from Ashlyns School, thereby busing in around 3,000 pupils to two schools so close together. The number of buses involved will cause a large amount of pollution. The schools need to be built further apart so as to service local students and thereby decreasing the number of buses required and pollution.</p> <p>4.Has a site visit actually been made by the planning team? If so you would have seen that the single track road at Darrs lane cannot accommodate the buses necessary to service the students. I attach photographs to show that at some points of the lane there are houses on both sides not allowing road widening. Having worked in Child Protection and Safeguarding I have serious concerns as to how a sufficiently wide pavement to keep the students safe can be accommodated. (Photographic evidence attached).</p> <p>5.Even if it was decided not to make a School entrance from Darrs Lane the amount of traffic would significantly increase. Since the development of Berroc Park 2 years ago there has been a large increase in (often speeding) cars and lorries. The concerns around this have previously been raised by local residents to the extent that the the Parish Council were looking into this last summer before your plan was voted through. I repeat has a visit been made to the area as the roads in this area are narrow and are not capable of supporting additional traffic?</p>

6.I understand the Government has subsequently reduced the number of houses required. Has the local plan also been proportionally reduced ?

7.To receive such a large Emerging Strategy for growth only 3 days before the plan closes is an insult to the local residents, a lot of whom still have not received one. Additionally the pictures of maps are so ridiculously small you can't clearly see where the developments are exactly.

8.Please take on board the comments made by myself and others and do not automatically rubber stamp the development.

**Included files**

[EGS13298.jpg](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS13299

**Person ID**

1270182

**Full Name**

Emma Goddard

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident of Berkhamsted for 37 years and having now moved to Tring this year.

I strongly oppose the south Berkhamsted and Tring development on green belt land.

Not only because of the loss of beautiful land that makes our towns the wonderful places they are to live but also having grown up and in Berkhamsted and now raising my own family I have seen a real deterioration in the schools and medical facilities over the recent years.

Also the current social housing stock is poorly maintained and so much could be done to improve on them before even considering building more.

Particularly Kingsley Walk/Rosebery Way areas of Tring. They are tired, unloved in many areas and really could do with some TLC.

I think the development as it stands is detrimental for many, many reasons.  
I do however feel that affordable housing needs to be developed and that the plans can be revised to consider the points I have raised.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13301

**Person ID** 1270184

**Full Name** Mr Michael Cook

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I live in [address redacted] and my property is called [address redacted] and directly looks over the lovely field between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane. Most mornings I open my blinds to look across the field, I have seen deer and lots of fox's plenty of red kites and rabbits. I feel it would be criminal to kick out all the wild life and change this for ever.

I have lived in Berkhamsted since 1969 and watched the town grow and now when sitting in traffic feel how the quality of life has gone down, so as you can gather I'm opposed to any more building in this area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13306

**Person ID** 1261215

**Full Name** Judith Monteath

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>In any event to be brief I completely disagree with plans to destroy the greenbelt and areas of ONB that were the very reason most current residents moved to Berkhamsted and the surrounding areas in the first place. Berkhamsted has already had massive amounts of new builds and no increase in infrastructure to support these, GPs, roads, station etc etc. WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE none of these houses were “affordable homes” and I suspect none of the new ones would be either so the moral blackmail being used by the council is extremely inappropriate.</p> <p>Personally I have been working in the Royal Free hospital trying to save the lives of hundreds of very sick people including Dacorum residents and my real solace was being able to return, all be it briefly, to an area where I can walk in the green spaces that I moved here to access.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13331
<b>Person ID</b>	1270200
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Harman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS13335
<b>Person ID</b>	1270204
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Natasha Dauncey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm writing to express my concern and object to plans to build 2200 more houses in Berkhamsted - in terms of both the scale but also proposed sites (on prime greenbelt land). Whilst I understand the need for additional housing in this area, there are a number of reasons this feels excessive and doesn't seem to be a workable solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• destruction of beautiful greenbelt land - THE key defining features of this area, and major reason for people wanting to live here</li> <li>• the resulting impact of loss of greenbelt land on wildlife, biodiversity, clean air / increased pollution - these open spaces and the peace/ tranquility they provide are also incredibly important for our health and wellbeing</li> <li>• traffic through the town is already excessive, particularly around times of school drop offs / pick ups (outside of lockdown) - the High Street and adjacent roads in particular become extremely congested. Walking along the High Street currently, the pollution and noise is noticeable. Increased housing/population will only exacerbate this</li> <li>• a lack of infrastructure to accommodate this additional housing/increased population - schools, GP practices, NHS dental practices, residential parking, broadband speed, open spaces/parks. Even the High Street shops aren't fit for purpose for an influx of new residents (and the last thing we need here is a retail park or chain stores)</li> <li>• a lack of respect for green spaces in new residential developments already in this area. I live in a small development that's 20 years old and the absence of trees / greenery is very noticeable</li> </ul> <p>It's notable that the proposals don't include plans to build on existing brownfield sites - why is this? And why isn't it being considered as a better alternative to destroying greenbelt sites?</p> <p>It's also important to highlight that in these situations, the balance of housing type is rarely reflective of the needs of the local population. It's clear more housing is needed for first time buyers and small families in this area, yet many housing developments are often larger (more expensive / profitable) properties that are out of reach financially for those that actually need them.</p>

Berkhamsted is a very special market town characterised by natural beauty - please don't destroy it with this plan, I urge you to reconsider! I'm sure with a little thought, there are areas of existing brownfield sites that could be prioritised for housing development.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13351

**Person ID** 490211

**Full Name** Ms Barbara Saville

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- The Council has a 2030 net zero commitment. Policy SP5 seeks to grow employment through the borough's close position to the M1 and M25 motorways. This contradicts the council's own net zero commitment as well as the UK's 2050 net zero commitment.
- Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or employment in Berkhamsted. These sites are therefore highly likely to attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. This is not sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.
- The policies do not take into account the impact of the Covid pandemic. The changes in lifestyle necessitated through the move towards home based and remote working, and increased flexibility towards home/work balance have not been properly taken into account.
- The plan does not take into account the likely increase in empty retail or office space in town centres as a result of the Covid changes, missing a once in a generation opportunity for change.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13353

**Person ID** 490211

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Barbara Saville
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Northchurch</b> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</li> <li>• The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</li> <li>• There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</li> <li>• Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</li> <li>• There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13397
<b>Person ID</b>	1153922

<b>Full Name</b>	Roger Hyslop
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13412
<b>Person ID</b>	1270229
<b>Full Name</b>	Homes England
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270231
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Ms Rebecca Dewey
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Associate Director WSP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	SP27 – Delivering Growth in Bovington



35b) Justified - No supporting evidence published to show the reasons for reducing the site ref. Bv02 allocation from 60 to 40 dwellings, despite insufficient housing supply.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13413

**Person ID** 1270229

**Full Name** Homes England

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1270231

**Agent Full Name** Ms  
Rebecca  
Dewey

**Agent Organisation** Associate Director  
WSP

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

CHANGES TO LOCAL PLAN

Housing Delivery: At least 244 261 dwellings will be delivered in the plan period. The contribution of all sources of housing supply for Bovingdon are shown in the following table:

**Table 43**

<b>Category</b>	<b>No. of Dwellings</b>
Known commitments	27
Strategic Allocations	190 210
Windfall	24

Growth Areas: The following table shows how new growth will be distributed in Bovingdon. Development of these sites will be supported where they are in accordance with the specific policy requirements (Bovingdon Allocations), and relevant local and national policies.

**Table 44**

Area	Type	Allocation
Bv01	Major Urban	Around 150 Extension dwellings with public open space.
		Safeguard 3ha for future education use.
Bv02	Residential	Around 40 led 60dwellings with public open space

The amendment of the wording in Table 44 supports the retention of site ref. Bv02's housing allocation at 60 dwellings and contributes to the Council's undersupply of housing. 1 Paragraph 35(a-d) of the NPPF (2019)

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13457

**Person ID** 1264853

**Full Name** Nick Davis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategy clearly prioritises building on Green Belt surrounding Berkhamsted. There are no plans to build on brownfield sites. The location of these sites means that residents are likely to travel into town via car increasing the town congestion problems.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13458
<b>Person ID</b>	1264853
<b>Full Name</b>	Nick Davis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The green belt land that will be destroyed by these plans play an important environmental role. They act as a barrier to the A41, and all trees and grasses help to lock in CO2 emissions. All new homes will be in close proximity to the busy dual carriageway, and families will be exposed to increased levels of pollution. The existing homes in the town will also be adversely affected.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13484
<b>Person ID</b>	490794
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Amanda Wilkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This is to record my objection to the proposed housing projects for Berkhamsted as laid out in the current 'Local Plan'. I do not feel I can phrase it any better than those Berkhamsted local councillors who describe the Plan as "too many houses and in the wrong places", almost as if you have ignored everything that they have been trying to say to you up to this point!</p> <p>I know that more housing is required but this plan is simply wrong for two main reasons:</p> <p>1/ Why must you persist in concreting over the Green Belt?</p> <p>2/ The amount of affordable housing included amongst the properties that will sell for more than half a million pounds is worse than woeful - is this some kind of social engineering project to prevent local young people being able to stay anywhere local?</p> <p>Please listen to the counter proposals rather than your 'I hear what you say' approach and then think about what is needed locally rather than Government quota targets. Listening to local people is why you were elected!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13485
<b>Person ID</b>	1270269
<b>Full Name</b>	WENDY CONIAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>4. Green Belt Release</p> <p>This plan inflicts a 25% increase in housing for Northchurch and Berkhamsted: 2250 homes, of which 1750 are on existing Green Belt land (78%).</p> <p>85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>

Various Governments have made numerous statements in support of the protection to our precious Green Belt over the years. As recently as December 16th 2020 this Government, published a response to the recent white paper consultations stated, with reference to protected landscapes and Green Belt, "We should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." This draft plan makes a mockery of such statements as the growth in homes across the Borough is driven entirely by a national target that bears no relation to actual local need, topography or infrastructure.

The National Planning Policy Framework (19 February 2019) (NPPF) states: "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (Paragraph 133 NPPF)." Releasing Green Belt land on the scale envisaged in this draft plan ought to be difficult to justify since paragraph 136 of the NPPF is totally clear that: "Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans." The "exceptional circumstances" that could justify release of Green Belt land on such a scale are simply not evidenced in these documents.

Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in aiming to provide at least 100% of the self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), the proposed Plan will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB. It also jeopardises plans, currently under early stages of discussion, to potentially extend the AONB or upgrade its status to that of a National Park.

Specifically, relating to proposed release of greenbelt on the southern side of Berkhamsted, the land between Shootersway in Berkhamsted and the A41 has always been considered as the "Green Lung" for Berkhamsted (not least by DBC itself in the last iteration of the Local Plan) – absorbing vehicle emissions from the A41. Traffic has increased significantly in recent years. The revised Local Plan must recognise that a green buffer is needed in addition to recognising that there is no need to release greenbelt to accommodate housing growth.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13488
<b>Person ID</b>	1270269
<b>Full Name</b>	WENDY CONIAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The Plan does little to recognise the charm and character of the borough’s market towns. In relation to Berkhamsted, the 2013 Core Strategy affirmed the Borough's commitment to maintaining the unique linear valley configuration of the town and recognised the importance of preserving the ridge skyline. Most of the sites chosen are on the southern ridge above Northchurch and Berkhamsted thus renegeing on that commitment and creating a massive urban sprawl that fundamentally would alter the character of the town.

6.1 Transport

The transport ‘strategy’ does not warrant the term. It takes no account of Berkhamsted’s topography and valley setting. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley. There are no significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow and all additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.

More importantly, no proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes or to make a step change in the provision of sustainable transport to meet the requirements of LTP4.

It is already acknowledged that Berkhamsted town centre is prone to excessive congestion and by the highways authority’s own assessment is ‘saturated’. The proposed new homes are predominantly sited over a mile away from the town up the steep valley sides. There seems to be no acknowledgement that the associated additional traffic flow cannot be accommodated. There is no scope for widening roads to facilitate traffic flow and the main cross roads in the centre of town is already at logjam for much of the day (outside of Covid restrictions).

There are no dedicated cycle ways in Berkhamsted and the existing footpaths that could connect these sites to the central hub were constructed as narrow high sided gloomy corridors.

The additional vehicle traffic which will follow the proposed housing, will add to an already poor air quality situation. The Borough is using an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018 and has not recognised that local air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.

Already, air quality is poor and borderline ‘legal’ in many parts of town. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor. The town lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides and air pollution naturally collects in this area.

6.2 Open Spaces and Community Facilities

Berkhamsted is already underserved with open public space and parks are at capacity. This Plan makes no significant improvements to public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)

There is no commitment to increased parkland provision - essential for child development and mental wellbeing. There is a shortage of sports pitch provision and despite the release of Haslam Fields, currently a sports field owned by Berkhamsted School, no additional provision is provided.

The filling in of all the existing Green Belt land mean that for the existing residents pedestrian access to reach natural countryside is massively compromised. Despite this there is little commitment in this plan to maintaining high quality access and green corridors. The ‘wildlife corridors’ are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don’t connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)

Berkhamsted is similarly underprovided with public community facilities and I would like to draw your attention to the proposals for the Berkhamsted Civic Centre as put forward by B-Hive. The Civic Centre has been recognised as an Asset of Community Value, and I hope that you recognise that it and the site on which it sits is not merely an asset for DBC to extract revenue. The proposals outline how more value can be derived from the area for the community and economy and I fully support them.

### 6.3 Health Services

There are no proposed additional health services – the existing planned new surgery at Gossoms End is supposed to be able to cope with ALL the new developments along with a minor extension of Manor Street. This approach is wholly inadequate. 7. Medical and Social Care: Despite the addition of an expected 6,000 people there are no plans to increase the already overstretched medical, dental and social care facilities.

### 6.4 Employment

There appear to be no plans to build employment zones or live/work units and so the plan is completely out of balance. 2250 new homes require significant numbers of new jobs.

Indeed, an existing employment area on the site of Jewsons is actually earmarked for residential housing. Despite some likely post-COVID increase in home working these developments will create even greater traffic volume as people drive either to the A41 or through the centre of town to Tring, Hemel Hempstead or cross town to the station. This makes a mockery of the sustainable communities pledge in the strategy guidance documents of last year. It also guarantees further increases in CO2 emissions thus undermining the climate emergency pledges made.

### 6.5 Water

The current Local Plan relies on outdated data, from a study in 2011 – which showed potential problems with water supply / drainage. The revised Local Plan must make it clear what impact the new development proposals will have on this, as well as sewage – especially if after review there is still a greater number of housing suggested.

The level of new housing currently proposed is expected to put severe strains on water supplies to Dacorum during the 2020s under drought conditions. In these circumstances there would be no option but to extract additional water from the chalk aquifer which in turn would cause further damage to the Borough's precious chalk streams. New supplies of water are not likely to be possible until after 2030.

The increased requirement for water will adversely impact the globally rare Bulbourne chalk stream.

Since much of the water supplied to Dacorum is pumped from groundwater in the chalk aquifer, water in many local catchments has become over-extracted giving rise to a decline in river flow. Any extra demand for water created by the new development in Berkhamsted and higher up the water course that has to be met by increased extraction from underground aquifers is likely to further contribute to reductions in water level in the Bulbourne, which will be particularly significant in dry summer months.

The Local Plan does not address how it will ensure that the aquifer and three chalk rivers in Dacorum are protected from over-extraction or how adequate water supplies will be made available in good time. Furthermore, additional extraction resulting from new housing that further damages the aquifer contravenes the Council's own policy in the draft Plan (DM33).

The Local Plan should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats and the Borough's own policies state that planning permission should be refused where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided.

As a chalk river, the River Bulbourne is of international significance and it falls into the category of a priority habitat under the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 (S41). Many species living in it and along the banks rely on a sustained flow of water which is normal in a natural chalk stream fed partly by underground springs like the Bulbourne.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13493

**Person ID** 1267159

**Full Name** ALISON HILLIER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

I am strongly opposed to the development as proposed in the plan. I believe that the plans will over-develop the town and will have detrimental impact on current and future residents. I do not believe our historic market town has the infrastructure to support the plans.

The proposed housing will cause us to lose green-belt land which is enjoyed by residents for leisure activities and will destroy the beautiful landscape and nature that we have. As a keen runner and a walker with my family, we gain a lot of benefit from the natural area. As a parent, I have concerns that my children will not have the natural beauty of the area to grow up in.

The proposal and development will cause increased traffic, particularly along Swing Gate which is home to two primary schools. I believe this would be dangerous for the pupils of those schools that enjoy the freedom of walking to school as well as adding congestion, noise, air pollution to an already traffic-heavy town.

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13497
<b>Person ID</b>	1270276
<b>Full Name</b>	CASPAR GIBILARO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has already responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses to sections in particular 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 17, 18,19, 22, 24, 25 in the attached document.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">BRAG-2021-submission-to-DBC-Local-Plan-Consultation-FINAL.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13507
<b>Person ID</b>	1270282
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHEN NEWMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to comment on the above development plan. my comments relate to Berkhamsted but may apply across Dacorum.</p> <p>Comparison of the Development Plan with your Infrastructure Delivery Plan presents a very inconsistent picture.</p> <p>You say in the infrastructure plan:</p> <p><b>Key Issues</b></p> <p>19.6 The key issues for Berkhamsted include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constraints imposed to expansion by the linear and valley character of Berkhamsted.</li> <li>• The attractive setting of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the surrounding wider countryside.</li> <li>• High house prices and a limited supply of affordable homes.</li> <li>• Limited opportunities within the urban area for development given strong existing local and historic character.</li> <li>• Capacity of existing local infrastructure.</li> <li>• The restructuring of the schooling to a two tier system has put pressure on secondary school places.</li> <li>• Lack of open spaces.</li> <li>• The Berkhamsted sports centre is in need of an upgrade.</li> <li>• Congestion on the local road network, particularly in the town centre.</li> <li>• Town centre car parks are at capacity.</li> <li>• Local bus services are modest and the valley topography discourages walking and cycling.</li> <li>• Air quality issues in Northchurch.</li> <li>• Pressure on existing employment areas from alternative uses, including housing.</li> </ul> <p>This is actually a very good summary, but the subsequent pages in the infrastructure plan offer no specific or credible solutions to these existing issues. The token road schemes proposed will not ease existing gridlock during peak school times (back from 8 March) and the funding for these is 'TBC' which in the current fiscal environment looks optimistic at best.</p>

You say three new schools are needed and this is down to Herts CC. If these are needed then the land required should be specifically allocated and shown. There is one picture of a potential school - Primary? 'Potential' does not give any confidence that this will actually materialise given that house builders are not held properly responsible for adequate parking, infrastructure or amenities.

Unfortunately, most of the sites for Ashlyns and Berkhamsted Schools are in the same part of the town and accessed via the same limited choice of roads. The new builds proposed are in most cases too far away to walk to these. These are also the same road networks providing access to the A41 by-pass for the majority of the new houses proposed. This is not only not sustainable, it will dramatically increase car usage, gridlock and pollution.

Your map of Berkhamsted is very misleading in the visual representation of green open spaces available to the community. Bearroc Park phase is wrongly shown as green space; school grounds are not available to the public; allotments are only available to holders; children's playgrounds are only available to young children and parents; private sports clubs are only available to members. There is no quality green space in the town at all.

Why are all these houses needed? The data points and projections used look to have been selected to maximise the expected demand, not provide a balanced view. There is also no prioritisation based on possible different future circumstances. The objective appears to be to get as much Green Belt land as possible released at once for housing. As well as supporting community wellbeing, almost all of the land to be concreted over is good quality arable. Recent vaccine spats with the EU indicate that further increasing our food security deficit is very unwise.

This level of building is in conflict with the need broadly accepted across all political parties to address the North/South divide in the UK. I know from my own direct experience that companies are hiring workers living in the North to work remotely on a permanent basis with no need or expectation for them to relocate further south.

I know that you have a difficult job reconciling competing priorities with limited resources, but you undermine the credibility and trust in local government by making lofty statements about sustainability, when it is clear that this plan is the exact opposite and in conflict with almost all if not all of your stated local plan objectives. Please can you be a bit more honest with us.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13532

**Person ID** 1270293

<b>Full Name</b>	Brian Hartley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I fully support the BRAG response and therefore would like this to be documented as part of Dacorum's Local Plan consultation. Please duplicate the BRAG representation against my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13533
<b>Person ID</b>	1270293
<b>Full Name</b>	Brian Hartley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b><u>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation</u></b>  I have lived in the Town of Berkhamsted for nearly 29 years and I am very strongly opposed to the proposed developments of at least 2,200 new homes on a number of sites that effectively stretch the size of Berkhamsted to the east and west. Berkhamsted with its relatively small densely packed town centre, congested overparked roads and side roads cannot take nor support the additional persons with or without vehicles that 2,200 new homes will bring. Traffic is very high in

the Town centre (pre-covid) from the high number of Private Schools and at times many local roads become gridlocked from overparking and school traffic.  
I feel that GP services of Berkhamsted and Tring will be overstretched as will Hospitals Services at Hemel and Watford.

**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS13535**Person ID** 1270294**Full Name** Mr Anthony Harbidge**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I have made submission on behalf of the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) through the consultation portal. However, I wish to make a personal submission, so please accept this email as my personal response to the consultation. Naturally I support BRAG's submission in full, so I request you duplicate BRAG's responses in full under my name for clarity I attach BRAG's response in pdf format.

**Included files****Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS13552**Person ID** 1260521**Full Name** Steve Ritchie**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p> <p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Tring image.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13564
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed Northchurch development. I am opposed to this on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the overall numbers of houses proposed across the Borough is too high</li> <li>- the need to build on the Green Belt has not been proven.</li> <li>- For me, the Green Belt is so important both for my physical and mental health and also as part of a wider issue to protect against climate change</li> <li>- the individual identity of Northchurch has been overlooked</li> <li>- it will increase road traffic issues and a risk to safety of all including children walking to and from local schools.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13589
<b>Person ID</b>	1270310
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eleanor Jelf
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In Berkhamsted the developments have been broken into lots of small parcels but the environmental and infrastructure impact would be as great as for one large development. The council should be considering the environmental impact and the pressures on infrastructure of their combined build.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13591
<b>Person ID</b>	1270310
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eleanor Jelf
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Sites around Berkhamsted:</p> <p>Over-development (building on most of the Green Belt fields surrounding Berkhamsted) will have a significant impact on the character of the town, the environment, the wildlife and biodiversity. The proposed developments are all at a significant distance from the town centre, not to mention uphill, these are not sustainable locations and make car use more likely for short trips into the historic centre. There are no exceptional circumstances justifying removal of this Green Belt land, in fact building here goes against the essential aim of Green Belt (permanent openness) by encroaching on the small amount of green breathing space encircling the town. Berkhamsted sits in a valley and so any new development on its valley sides is very visible. The 31% increase in housing (on top of many recent new large developments) is excessive. The River Bulbourne, an internationally important chalk stream, along with the ecosystem and wildlife dependent on it, will be adversely affected. Local infrastructure cannot support such a large increase in population, the water supply is already over-extracted, there is little public transport, the road capacity is limited by a valley location and roads are already congested and polluted from existing recent developments. Other considerations include the fact that schools and doctors' surgeries in the town are increasingly overwhelmed and that the historic and rural character of a small market town like Berkhamsted could be easily and permanently destroyed by careless over-development of this kind.</p>



For all sites and proposals: review buildings in urban areas across Dacorum to consider those no longer in business use for conversion to residential use.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13603

**Person ID** 1270314

**Full Name** Ms Claire Mistry

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Other important points that should be addressed in the revised Local Plan are:

**Impact on infrastructure**

The proposed level of development in Dacorum, along with potential development in neighbouring St Albans City and District, Three Rivers District and in Buckinghamshire east of Aylesbury, would place an unacceptable burden on all types of infrastructure services and facilities in Dacorum. The plan as proposed does little to address the improvements in infrastructure required to support the proposed increase in housing.

Specifically:

- The transport study must take into account of Berkhamsted's geography and valley setting. Most building is proposed along the top of the valley.
- Significant proposals should be made for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed on to Shootersway, Kings Road to town/station, and various rat-runs to avoid inevitable congestion.
- Proposals must be made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes.
- Significant improvements should be described for public open spaces (apart from garden-sized suggestions only.)

- The 'wildlife corridors' must be more than a narrow strip along the A41, and must connect with meaningful habitats (e.g. tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
- Additional health services must be provisioned. The new surgery at Gossoms End is will not be able to cope with ALL the new developments. At present, only a minor extension of Manor Street is proposed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13605

**Person ID** 1270314

**Full Name** Ms Claire Mistry

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

**Air quality**

As a town situated in a valley, air pollution is a significant issue which must be taken into consideration in a revised Local Plan.

- Air quality is borderline in many parts of town, verging on illegal at times. Northchurch has had additional monitoring for several years as air quality is so poor.
- Berkhamsted lies along a valley, with most residential areas along the bottom and up the sides. Air pollution naturally collects in this area.
- The current Local Plan uses an outdated Air Quality Action Plan from 2014-2018. Air quality has not improved since then, and recently, significantly, air pollution has been legally listed as a cause of death.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13634
<b>Person ID</b>	1270340
<b>Full Name</b>	WINFRIED STOCKLE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The plan is proposing 2,200 new houses in Berkhamsted with hundreds of those in Northchurch being built on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The two sites near us are BK06 (Darrs Lane to Bell Lane) and BK08 (between Shootersway and the A41).</p> <p>Key objections:</p> <p>All land on these two sites is in Green Belt. Green Belt is important to protect for the environment (habitats and wildlife), pollution control (acting as a natural barrier between urban and rural areas) and our wellbeing (access to nature is good for our health as proved throughout the pandemic).</p> <p>Specifically the site between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane contains hedgerows at either side with an abundance of wildlife living in them or passing through. Badgers, bats and tawny owls are often seen or heard. Ancient trees line both sides of Bell Lane. The view over the valley from the top is stunning (this would disappear once houses were there). Bell Lane provides a nice safe (cars rarely go up and down) single track country walk which many local people enjoy.</p> <p>The site between Shootersway and the A41 is a mix of forest and fields, which acts as a natural noise and pollution barrier for Northchurch (the trees absorb the Carbon dioxide and Nitrogen Dioxide emissions from the heavy A41 traffic). Development at both sites would lead to a significant increase in traffic and hence pollution. Already there is much congestion at Tesco Express (cars waiting for spaces and blocking Northchurch High Street) and Darrs Lane being a single track road is not fit for any further traffic. The answer is not to widen Darrs Lane as this would result in destruction of all the hedgerows. We need to recognise that this beautiful part of Northchurch is important to the village, and we need to keep as is for the sake of the environment, wildlife and human health.</p> <p>2,200 houses across Berkhamsted is too many. We understand that the numbers are inflated and based on an outdated algorithm, and latest population numbers are showing a decrease rather than increase. It would be better to revise the plan to build only on brownfield sites with a realistic number of houses and present that to the government instead. Green Belt was assigned as such for good reasons and we should honour those and protect it for generations to come.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13648
<b>Person ID</b>	1270345
<b>Full Name</b>	CLARE SIDEBOTTOM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to lodge my objections to the proposed Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038. My objections are based on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You are proposing to build on greenbelt land in Northchurch. You will be destroying areas of natural beauty. The ability to access such areas of beauty so easily is the main reason we moved to this village in the first place. I am a keen runner and run 5 days a week throughout our local area. Some of these areas will no longer exist, and those that do will be so overrun with traffic I will no longer feel safe. What about the wildlife that lives in these areas? What will the impact on these be? What alternative options are you exploring?</li> <li>• The development of this greenbelt land contradicts the government's climate change initiatives. There is no evidence in the plan relating to how recommendations contained In the Climate Change Committee Sixth carbon budget report Dec 2020 are being considered.</li> <li>• Our local services can't cope as it is. This will only worsen. Berkhamsted doesn't have a police station, how do you envisage this larger town coping with an increased population, and no police station to control this?</li> <li>• Given that a lot of office space will soon become available, due to the increased rate of remote working, why not explore retail/office plots first, before destroying greenbelt land?</li> <li>• Our local area does not need more housing.</li> <li>• The impact this will have on the identity of Northchurch is simply heart-breaking. We are a village and have no desire to become part of "West Berkhamsted."</li> <li>• I am concerned about water management and flood risk. There appears to be little consideration in the plan to address scenarios relating to either of these.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13651

<b>Person ID</b>	1270345
<b>Full Name</b>	CLARE SIDEBOTTOM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ultimately the safety of our children is our main concern. Our son is nearly 11 and due to start Secondary school in September, we want to feel confident he is safe when he walks to school, especially in the winter when the nights draw in. Our daughter's best friend lives at the top of Darrs Lane, there is no footpath on Darrs lane upwards of St Mary's avenue. With single lane access, no footpath and the expected increased traffic due to the development, I fear she will not be able to walk to her friend's house. Pedestrian safety is paramount and any resident must be able to feel safe walking between 2 properties in Northchurch without fear for their life.</li> </ul> <p>These plans will benefit no one apart from the developers. When we chose to move to Northchurch we chose to live in a village. You will be forcing us to live in a town. It will have a catastrophic impact on traffic, road safety, the environment and the overall feel of the local community. We simply will not be safe. Decisions are not based on the latest up to date information, no consideration has been taken on the impact of the pandemic, or on climate change, data sourced is out of date and there is a notable lack of flexibility by the council to keep up with this latest data. The process for getting planning permission has been underhand and untimely given the pandemic.</p> <p>The plan and strategy must be reconsidered immediately.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13652
<b>Person ID</b>	1270348
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA RAYFIELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13653
<b>Person ID</b>	1270349
<b>Full Name</b>	BRUCE RAYFIELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13654
<b>Person ID</b>	494033

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Shell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation using research, knowledge and time for consideration which it is unrealistic for most individual respondents to have available. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name, and to note my heartfelt opposition to many of the proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13662
<b>Person ID</b>	1153415
<b>Full Name</b>	Graham Paterson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I commend the level of effort and sense of public service which Dacorum BC employees have contributed and demonstrated in creating this strategic plan, however I regret to have to state that I consider its conclusions to be fatally flawed. Since my principal comment relates only to Question 7 of your consultation comments form, I have simply included my answer to that question below in this email, rather than enclose a fully completed form. My views on all the other questions in</p>

the comments form are very articulately covered by the official responses to the strategic plan submitted to you by Berkhamsted Town Council, Berkhamsted Citizens' Association and Berkhamsted Residents Action Group.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13676

**Person ID** 1270352

**Full Name** Jasmine Mitchell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

South berkhamsted project

I would like to state my strongest objection to the above planning application for the development of housing.

The beauty of the town such as the green belt areas we are so lucky to have which makes our town such a beautiful place, continues to be destroyed. We are seeing this happen again and again.

An increase in homes built on the green belt in my area will be putting pressure on existing traffic and air quality, as well as our local amenities such as doctors and especially schools.

For the reasons above I absolutely object to this development.

I have been a local resident for 16 years now and do not wish for the town to be destroyed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13687

**Person ID** 742793

**Full Name** Mr Lawrence Sutton

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email in addition to my response that I have made via the consultation portal.</p> <p>I would also like to fully support The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) response to the consultation.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13689
<b>Person ID</b>	1263863
<b>Full Name</b>	Liz Temple
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to register my objection to the above consultation.</p> <p>I moved to this wonderful town (Berkhamsted) some 9 years ago now and have loved every minute of it.</p> <p>I moved from NW London and coming here was literally a breath of fresh air - gone was the polluted air, overcrowding, and the feeling of being a stranger in an overcrowded town.</p> <p>I moved here and people smiled at you, cars stopped to let you cross the road, I could be in the country in a few minutes walk from my home and there's a wonderful sense of community spirit. You are going to ruin this beautiful area with all the planning currently going on and the proposed future planning. Berkhamsted will lose its small town status, it will swallow up Northchurch and very soon encompass Cow Roast and then Tring, not to mention Bourne End at the other</p>

end. Even with the new multistorey car park, parking is difficult and local businesses will suffer (once life returns to 'normal', post-covid), there are already insufficient GP practices (appointments will return to being difficult to get) and most of all, what the 'planners' seem to ignore is that Berkhamsted is a VALLEY TOWN ... every bit of traffic has to come either via the High Street, Bridgewater Road or via the already overcrowded and impassable Victorian roads on the other side of the valley. The whole town will become a car park with nothing moving.

PLEASE think again and protect this lovely town before it's too late. Once it's gone, it's gone forever!!

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13690

**Person ID** 1270354

**Full Name** John Parsons

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- The numbers of houses stated in the Plan to be required in the Berkhamsted area are not compatible with numbers quoted in the previous Plan or with local experience and demand. It also does not show the true demand in the area which is for truly affordable houses rather than the expensive houses which are the majority of housing built in the area. There is no shortage of the latter but a vast shortage of houses which can be afforded by people on average or near average wage. This outcome of this plan will not alter this situation
- With respect to the Berkhamsted area the Plan has followed the previous plan by concentrating on the southern area of the town adjacent to the A41, which while it provides ostensibly easily accessible land for housing, completely ignores the geography of the town with its steep sided east-west valley with the subsequent shortage of north-south access which makes access to the town from the proposed housing areas, difficult and expensive. It also ignores the problems of parking and circulation which is so pronounced in the older parts of the town, through which the access from the proposed sites will have to be routed
- With regard to the proposals for Northchurch, they again are on Green belt land and ignore the local geography consisting of the very narrow and congested High Street area with its busy junction with the New Road. This is a densely built up area with a Junior school and a very old and narrow Canal Bridge affected by the proposals. Both

the Darrs Lane scheme and the Lockside scheme are in difficult areas for access and construction, the former with steep slopes and very narrow access lane emerging from a highly populated area of affordable housing. The latter will require extensive and expensive access work which again makes it very unlikely that affordable houses will be built on either site.

- The number of houses required in the Berkhamsted Area is not compatible with historical evidence or experience. It also falls into the trap of classifying demand as of "houses " rather than the truly economic houses which is what is required in the B'sted area, where there are plenty of expensive houses but a great shortage of houses that can be afforded by people on average or somewhat above wages.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13692

**Person ID** 1270355

**Full Name** Louise Jenkins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to register my objection to the proposed Dacorum Local Plan for Berkhamsted. Having read through the proposed plans and heard what happened at the recent meeting it would appear that even members of the council do not think it is an advisable plan.

Our doctors and our schools are already at capacity if not more - trying to get a doctors appointment is a nightmare. The extra traffic it would bring to the town would severely impact already stretched parking facilities and probably the most important of all it is on green belt land! This is supposed to be land that is safe from development- surely it is extremely short sighted to carry on with this plan. If green belt isn't sacred then we risk developing the whole of an area of outstanding natural beauty.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS13752
<b>Person ID</b>	1270369
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Fiona Porter-Hough
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>It is with huge concern that I write as a resident of our lovely village community of Northchurch, to express my feelings on the proposal for housing to be built here, on our treasured Green Belt land within close proximity to our village centre. We have been fortunate enough to have lived here for the past 15 years, in a quiet road, side by side with neighbours, many of whom have resided here for 40 years or more.</p> <p>What makes Northchurch so special is that it isn't just an extension of Berkhamsted. It is a village in its own right, with a crossroads at the centre and the local St Mary's Primary School, St Mary's Church and the Baptist Church at the very heart of our community spirit.</p> <p>It sits here in our beautiful elongated valley running alongside the Grand Union Canal and the River Bulbourne, in a wildlife corridor. This in turn is bordered by the ancient woodland of the Ashridge Estate, belonging to the National Trust. Wildlife corridors run along the valley and waterways and criss cross from opposite sides of the valley. Muntjac deer are often seen wandering off the fields running either side of Darrs Lane, fields that are part of just one area that has been proposed for housing development.</p> <p><b>Traffic congestion</b></p> <p>The development above, proposed on the SW side of the valley, is bordering a very narrow single width steep lane that drops down into the ever growing busyness of a road junction and the limited parking area outside Tesco Northchurch, which sites back from the High Street. Congestion in this small restricted area has increased when 'One Stop' became Tesco and attracts people not only walking from the immediate area of Northchurch but also from surrounding housing</p>

estates of the Bridgewater housing Estate which is on the opposite side of the valley. It is always a busy hub as it allows people to buy essential food items in the immediate vicinity without having to try and park in the picturesque, highly popular town of Berkhamsted, which has seen an increase in traffic and parking in recent years.

The second proposed site, Lockfield, is on the opposite side of the High St here in the village. This area is accessible from a point near to a one way passing across a narrow bridge over the Grand Union Canal joining an already busy narrow road of 'New Road', a road which leads straight into the heart of Northchurch high Street, passing the front entrance of St Mary's Primary School and connecting at the busy T-junction where the two roads meet.

These two housing development sites will cause a significant increase in traffic to the village, disproportional to the size of our village infrastructure and creating danger along many of the small, often one track country lanes leading down into the centre. The High Street itself already experiences through traffic from Tring to Berkhamsted and it is this main road along with 'New Road' that many school children have to cross when attending the Primary School. With proposed increase in housing in Tring too our narrow High Street is going to become a more popular route for traffic accessing Berkhamsted and the Ashridge Estate.

### **Greenbelt invasion**

As our lives have become busier so has the importance of Green Belt. Its value on health and wellbeing can't be undervalued. Green Belt are areas where wildlife flourishes, where improved air quality is found and nature reigns. Without these areas, land becomes just one continuous man-made development. Rain water has nowhere to seep into the ground and there is no end to the long term environmental impact that it will have. The law says we can only build on the Green Belt if it has been proven necessary but no one has proven this. Development the Brown Field sites is surely a much better solution and way forward instead of encroaching on Green Belt. Once Green Belt is built on is it lost forever.

### **The number of houses proposed in Dacorum**

House building forecast was based on an algorithm which has since been scrapped. However numbers have been altered by the Government to justify these out of date figures and instead of seeing a fall in houses being proposed, there has been a rise as everything is now based on out of date 2014 projections. The proposed number of 16,899 houses across the borough is far too high. It does not reflect projected population growth and will instead be detrimental to the whole of the area, in terms of increased congestion on roads, poorer air quality, hard surfaces leading to problems with surface water and environmental impact on our nature and wildlife.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13782
<b>Person ID</b>	1144292
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Hyland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamsted, [XX], I would like to make the following points regarding the proposed developments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I appreciate the need for more housing but am concerned that this is not the right housing for the demand. The development at the end of Swing Gate Lane is a great success giving housing to local people, surely, we need more developments like this providing local housing for local people rather than 850 houses on green belt land that leads to extra traffic and removes the green lungs between the town and the A41.</li> <li>• Although the development at the top of Swing Gate Lane states that the primary access will be from Chesham Road there will be extra traffic on the already busy Swing Gate Lane. With a school at either end of the lane school drop of and pick up already cause traffic chaos. The addition of another 850 houses will only add to this chaos. There appears to be an assumption that residents will walk up Swing Gate Lane this doesn't consider the size of the hill which young children will struggle with leading parents to drive. Also there appears to be no allowance for a change in the junction of Swing Gate Lane and London Road. On a weekly basis turning right into Swing Gate is a hazard as cars coming from Hemel direction do not give way at the mini roundabout.</li> <li>• With the global pandemic of the last year the working lives of many people have changed with homeworking becoming the norm for many organisations leading to many families deciding to move further away from their commuter belt homes and further into the countryside. I know of at least 4 families that have left Berkhamsted for areas such as Suffolk and Dorset. The papers are reporting that organisations such as HSBC are reducing office space by 40% and my husband's office will now only have desks for 1 in 10 workers. This huge change needs to be considered within these plans. Also, in the plans for the housing more time at home means an increased demand for local green area this plan removes our local green areas from residents of Swing Gate Lane.</li> <li>• At present any large downfall of rain leads to torrents of water running down the lower end of Swing Gate lane with increased concreted areas at the top of the hill this will only lead to increased rainfall with nowhere to go, I can't</li> </ul>

see in the plans where these issues have been taken into account, building at the top of the valley will have a huge impact on the bottom of the valley.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13901

**Person ID** 1264756

**Full Name** Kathryn Salway

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two-storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlinked and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13903
<b>Person ID</b>	1264756
<b>Full Name</b>	Kathryn Salway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13931
<b>Person ID</b>	1262752
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Saunders
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) of which i am a member has responded in full to the consultation. I fully support these responses.</p> <p>Therefore to avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13936
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My comments apply specifically to the 'Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy', the Introduction to which is set out in the following extract from the Draft Local Plan. My response to Question 1 is also applicable.</p> <p>(see attachment)</p> <p>The sites identified for new housing are generally around the periphery of Berkhamsted and many of them would 'infill' between the existing built-up areas of the town and either the A.41 or the adjacent village of Northchurch. The additional housing development would, as the name suggests, lead to the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Northchurch into one urban area, detracting from the character of both settlements. The local road network to the south-west of Berkhamsted is poor and would be incapable of dealing with the inevitable increase in local traffic without expensive road widening.</p> <p>The site identified as 'South Berkhamsted' as its name suggests infills much of the land between the existing built-up area of Berkhamsted and the A.41 It sits on a sensitive ridge-top location and the existing road network is poor or non-existent. Any new roads would inevitably feed additional traffic through existing housing areas and past schools.</p>

Swing Gate Lane in particular is totally unsuited to becoming even a secondary means of access to the new housing development, having as it does, two schools for under-12 year olds on its length. At best, it could offer a route for a shuttle bus service to/ from central Berkhamsted.

As recognised in paragraph 23.119 of the draft Local Plan, Berkhamsted already experiences a high level of congestion. No measures are identified in the Local Plan to mitigate against the inevitable increase in road traffic generated by increasing the population of the town by up to 25%.

The Draft Local Plan continues, at paragraph 23.121: *“Given their ‘edge of town’ locations, Growth Areas will need to focus on ensuring they are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station, and public and sustainable options are enhanced. All Growth Areas will be required to provide for on and off site measures to alleviate local highway problems”*

No suggestions are made in the Local Plan as to what on-site or off-site measures are intended to alleviate traffic problems over the medium and long term.

The Local Plan makes reference at paragraph 23.122 to the ‘Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy’. However, this document offers no strategy to encourage sustainable transport in either of these towns. This paragraph also states that Berkhamsted is served by a “key inter-urban Aylesbury – Hemel – Watford bus route”. Whilst this bus route does fulfil the Local Plan’s dubious criteria for providing a “good public transport service”, the reality is that, pre-COVID, it operated at a frequency of 3 buses per hour on Monday-Friday, 2 buses per hour on Saturdays and 1 bus per hour on Sunday shopping hours. There is no evening service or early service on Saturdays. Due to its length, it also suffers from reliability issues. Considering that public transport on axes other than north- west to south-east is almost non-existent, and the topography of Berkhamsted – a valley town – which discourages cycling. I strongly disagree with the statement in the Local Plan that “a sustainable transport network is in place in Berkhamsted”.

**Included files**

[EGS13936.docx](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS13940

**Person ID**

1145435

**Full Name**

Mr Paul Crosland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In general the justification for including most of the Berkhamsted sites are a result of planners accepting a central Government target and claiming this as exceptional circumstances despite central Government' stated commitment to protecting the Green Belt. Most of these proposed allocations should be rejected. The weakness of infrastructure plans are highlighted elsewhere but I question how and by whom the networks of new pedestrian links with adjacent allocations are to be provided.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13957
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My comments apply specifically to the 'Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy', the Introduction to which is set out in the following extract from the Draft Local Plan. My response to Question 1 is also applicable.</p> <p>(see attachment)</p> <p>The sites identified for new housing are generally around the periphery of Berkhamsted and many of them would 'infill' between the existing built-up areas of the town and either the A.41 or the adjacent village of Northchurch. The additional housing development would, as the name suggests, lead to the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Northchurch into one</p>

urban area, detracting from the character of both settlements. The local road network to the south-west of Berkhamsted is poor and would be incapable of dealing with the inevitable increase in local traffic without expensive road widening.

The site identified as 'South Berkhamsted' as its name suggests infills much of the land between the existing built-up area of Berkhamsted and the A.41. It sits on a sensitive ridge-top location and the existing road network is poor or non-existent. Any new roads would inevitably feed additional traffic through existing housing areas and past schools. Swing Gate Lane in particular is totally unsuited to becoming even a secondary means of access to the new housing development, having as it does, two schools for under-12 year olds on its length. At best, it could offer a route for a shuttle bus service to/ from central Berkhamsted.

As recognised in paragraph 23.119 of the draft Local Plan, Berkhamsted already experiences a high level of congestion. No measures are identified in the Local Plan to mitigate against the inevitable increase in road traffic generated by increasing the population of the town by up to 25%.

The Draft Local Plan continues, at paragraph 23.121: *“Given their ‘edge of town’ locations, Growth Areas will need to focus on ensuring they are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station, and public and sustainable options are enhanced. All Growth Areas will be required to provide for on and off site measures to alleviate local highway problems”*

No suggestions are made in the Local Plan as to what on-site or off-site measures are intended to alleviate traffic problems over the medium and long term.

The Local Plan makes reference at paragraph 23.122 to the 'Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy'. However, this document offers no strategy to encourage sustainable transport in either of these towns. This paragraph also states that Berkhamsted is served by a “key inter-urban Aylesbury – Hemel – Watford bus route”. Whilst this bus route does fulfil the Local Plan’s dubious criteria for providing a “good public transport service”, the reality is that, pre-COVID, it operated at a frequency of 3 buses per hour on Monday-Friday, 2 buses per hour on Saturdays and 1 bus per hour on Sunday shopping hours. There is no evening service or early service on Saturdays. Due to its length, it also suffers from reliability issues. Considering that public transport on axes other than north-west to south-east is almost non-existent, and the topography of Berkhamsted – a valley town – which discourages cycling, I strongly disagree with the statement in the Local Plan that “a sustainable transport network is in place in Berkhamsted”.

**Included files**

[EGS13936.docx](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS13961
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In general the justification for including most of the Berkhamsted sites are a result of planners accepting a central Government target and claiming this as exceptional circumstances despite central Government' stated commitment to protecting the Green Belt. Most of these proposed allocations should be rejected. The weakness of infrastructure plans are highlighted elsewhere but I question how and by whom the networks of new pedestrian links with adjacent allocations are to be provided.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13991
<b>Person ID</b>	1270412
<b>Full Name</b>	James Mullins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(7) Housing Strategy is a crucial section. It gives more detail of where homes are to be located. I have serious concerns about the allocation and how the numbers have been calculated and a missed opportunity to avoid Green Belt development at Berkhamsted and Tring. The Housing Strategy is fuelled by faulty vision, settlement hierarchy, unjustified housing

target and exacerbated by flawed handling of windfall projections, thus failing to maximise growth in urban areas at the expense of Green Belt. Also fail to take into account post-pandemic working practices.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13998

**Person ID** 1270412

**Full Name** James Mullins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.

(24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14007

**Person ID** 1270424

**Full Name** OLNEY JOSEPHINA

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have only recently been made aware of the consultation regarding the strategic house building plans for the borough of Dacorum.</p> <p>I have read the response from Berkhamsted Citizens to you and add my name to that.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14019
<b>Person ID</b>	1270425
<b>Full Name</b>	EMMA LELIEVELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The capacity to absorb the growth of 50% sustainably is questionable. Before moving to the pre-application stage, DBC must provide details how and by whom the sustainability goals would be delivered and adjust the proposed number of new dwellings accordingly.</p> <p>On traffic congestion specifically, the HCC engineers have concluded that the traffic lights in the town centre junction already operate at over capacity. Alternative routes are unlikely to be capable of being widened without very costly investment. Engineers must also assess the capacity of the Kings Road/Shootersway junction which has already produced outcomes for local residents which were not anticipated at the time it was constructed e.g.: residents of Tower Close were refused 'keep clear' road markings on the grounds that it was unnecessary because traffic to and from these streets</p>

would not impact the functioning of the junction. Yet, this turning is regularly blocked at peak times and traffic turning right can slow traffic coming through the junction from Kingshill Way.

Also, while the lack of school capacity is noted in the plan and land for new schools is provided for in some development sites, there is no plan for funding nor a clear plan for constructing the required additional capacity. Detailed plans should be provided before moving to the pre-application stage.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14020

**Person ID** 1270425

**Full Name** EMMA LELIEVELD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The comments that follow concern the land allocations along Shootersway in Berkhamsted, namely BK02, BK03, BK04, BK05, BK06 and BK08. DBC should consider a targeted consultation with local residents in the area as many assertions in the consultation document do not reflect their lived experience of the area and views of how further housing development would impact the quality of life and local environment for existing residents. There are compelling reasons to reduce the number of sites in this area for new development.

- 1 Impact of developments within the current plan - There are a number of developments already planned or underway in this area which will impact the surrounding area regardless of any new housing that may be built as part of the proposed Local Plan 2020-2038. These sites include Bearroc Park Phase II, the site at the top of Durrants Lane, the Elysian development at Hanburys and the proposed care home on the site of the golf range. The full effect of these developments is not yet known and therefore neither measured nor documented for consideration as part of this consultation. Local residents have already noticed a significant increase in traffic and congestion as a result of Bearroc Park Phase I. It is likely that formal analysis would show a decrease in air quality and other impacts that



will be relevant to these consultations and this evidence must be gathered and considered before moving to the pre-application stage.

- 1 Housing need vs capacity - The proposed Local Plan seems to suggest that ultimately all these sites be developed yet the need for so many new dwellings in this location is not clear (see response to Q1). The number proposed new dwellings should be re-examined in the light of the many questions raised about the validity of the government's target (vs ONS projections) and DBC's decision that the plan should deliver the target without modifications to take account of constraints such as needs of the local community and impact on the Green Belt. The capacity for so much new housing in this location should also be re-examined. For example, the main routes for car and delivery traffic to these sites are via Kings Road and Cross Oak Road, both of which have existing, well-documented There is therefore scope for some of these sites to be rejected on grounds of both capacity and need.
- 1 Types of housing - Developers in this part of town are renowned for their preference for building large, expensive private family homes. As a result, there is a marked shortage of affordable homes and this is reducing diversity in this part of Berkhamsted and in local schools to the detriment of the local community. Any new development must be sure to include legally binding commitments on developers to meet the 40% target for affordable housing and refuse requests from developers to 'buy out' of their statutory obligation.
- 1 Functioning of Kingshill Way/Shootersway junction - The development of hundreds of additional dwellings in this area would certainly impact the functioning of the new lights at this junction. As noted above, local residents have noticed (before the pandemic) a significant increase in congestion due to the construction of Bearroc Park Phase I. Further development will increase traffic along Shootersway at peak times once things return to normal after the Traffic already hinders access to neighbouring streets such as Oxfield Close and Tower Close (noting that Herts CC refused "Keep Clear" road markings for these streets on the grounds that they were unnecessary). It is worth noting that when traffic is free flowing through the junction, cars accelerate at speed from the lights towards Shootersway, which would make entering and leaving the proposed sites at Hanburys and Haslam Fields particularly hazardous.
- 1 Pedestrian safety - Both the highway and pavements on Shootersway between the water tower and the top of Cross Oak Road are extremely narrow. The width of the pavement is already wholly inadequate and narrowing due to the encroachment of trees and vegetation from the houses along that section of Shootersway. Indeed, many residents wonder if the existing pavement conforms to the legal minimum width. It is now impossible for pedestrians to pass without walking in to the road and this is a hazard for children walking to and from local schools (Greenway, St Thomas More and Ashlyns). It is only a matter of time before a child is hit on the back of the head with a wing mirror or has a worse accident at the hands of a speeding car. The section of Shootersway and the pavement would have to be widened before any new development could be considered in this area. Separately, the

development of the Hanburys and Haslam Field sites would add significant additional traffic to this section of Shootersway and should be discounted accordingly.

- 1 Pedestrian access to town centre - As noted above, pedestrian access from the ridge area of Berkhamsted to the town centre is already inadequate. The proposed plan for new housing includes a commitment to provide networks of new pedestrian links but without details of how and by whom they would be provided. This detail must be set out before the pre-application stage. Separately, there was previously a local petition for a shuttle bus service to and from the town centre to ease congestion and provide residents of the ridge area with an alternative to taking their cars to the town. This should also be revisited as part of the sustainability plan.
- 1 Long-term infrastructure development - A long term plan to expand and upgrade infrastructure in this area is already overdue and there seems no plan as to how and by whom new infrastructure would be provided for any new dwellings. This would include water, sewerage, schools, medical services and public green spaces. This must be provided and consulted on prior to the pre-submission
- 1 Cumulative impact of development - It is a great frustration to the local community that each planning application within the current plan is considered in isolation from other developments and provides no opportunity to assess the cumulative impact of all the developments as a whole and address the infrastructure needs of the area. For example, Bearroc Park Phases I & II have been built even though they add to congestion, air pollution or pressure on narrow local roads. DPC must address this by setting out in detail for local residents how further development in this area could realistically meet established policies for managing environmental impact, achieving sustainability and delivering adequate local infrastructure without detriment to existing residents of the area. This must be addressed before the pre-submission stage so that the local community has the opportunity to share their lived experience with DBC and scrutinise credible proposals to meet the policy goals any new development would be required to meet. An overarching plan that all future developers would be expected to work collectively to deliver should be at the heart of any future Local Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14063

**Person ID** 1270476

**Full Name** ALISON CHESHIRE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Council has a 2030 net zero commitment. Policy SP5 seeks to grow employment through the borough's close position to the M1 and M25 motorways. This contradicts the council's own net zero commitment as well as the UK's 2050 net zero commitment.</p> <p>Too much of the housing proposed in Northchurch is at the top of steep hills, far from the train station or (limited) employment in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>These sites therefore attract two car families, as journeys to shops, work and doctors' appointments will require cars. We've seen this already, with the Bearoc Park development.</p> <p>This isn't sustainable and does not take account of the responsibility to address climate change.</p> <p>The policies also fail to take into account the impact of the Covid pandemic and the resulting changes working patterns necessitated through the move towards home working.</p> <p>The plan does not take into account the likely increase in empty retail or office space in town centres as a result of the Covid changes, missing a once in a generation opportunity for change.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14065
<b>Person ID</b>	1270476
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON CHESHIRE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Northchurch is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school which my two daughters attend, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct, village identity. People know each other by name and sight. It's a delightful little village which we're proud to be part of. There is a small community feel that we and our neighbours, value greatly.</p> <p>Has anyone in Borough pushing this plan, even been to Northchurch??</p> <p>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous and devastating increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements. The main High Street and New Road were already bumper to bumper traffic in peak times, without the additional strain which will follow with this proposal.</p> <p>There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition). Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street.</p> <p>Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses. There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety.</p> <p>This increased pollution will risk the long-term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns. This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS14110
<b>Person ID</b>	1270501
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID WHITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Northchurch is not mentioned in the Delivery Strategy. Instead, Northchurch is referred to as ‘West Berkhamsted’: there is no such place as West Berkhamsted. The Delivery Strategy blurs the clear boundaries between two very different communities: Northchurch and Berkhamsted. Policy SP20 Table 35 Growth Areas describes the developments in and around Northchurch village as ‘major urban extension’. Berkhamsted is urban; Northchurch is not. It is a semi-rural village that attracts an older resident due to its location, local amenities and rural feel, while providing easy access to Berkhamsted and Tring. By failing to acknowledge that Northchurch exists, the Delivery Strategy fails to assess the impact that overcrowding and increased traffic flows will have on Northchurch residents and their quality of life.</p> <p>The proposed developments contradict a key aim of the Delivery Strategy: ‘to focus on ensuring that developments are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station’. (Para 23.121)</p> <p>The proposed developments in Northchurch are on a steep hill and are 5 kms from the shopping centre and train station. This is too far for residents to walk which means they will take their cars. The Development Strategy recognises that ‘there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town’. The roads leading from the proposed development sites to the town centre are equally restricted and the increase in traffic would lead to congestion and health and environmental issues for residents of Northchurch. None of the proposed development in Northchurch would allow residents to walk to any amenities and therefore, the locations are neither sustainable nor environmentally friendly.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14125
<b>Person ID</b>	1270503

<b>Full Name</b>	TOM RITCHIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>DETAILED COMMENTS ON BERKHAMSTED</p> <p>Whilst accepting that a level of additional housing is inevitable, for the following detailed reasons, the house numbers allocated to specific sites in Berkhamsted are completely at odds with the town's ability to provide adequate infrastructure. To allow the original process to be driven towards locations, only identified by the "call for sites" process was bad enough. For the second Consultation to ignore the comments made in the first process, about the unsuitability of many of these sites, is even worse.</p> <p>Surely the whole point about a Local Plan is to coordinate all the available and suitable sites with the current or future possible infrastructure available to support considerable increases in population - none of this has been done to a satisfactory level, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 House location - the current proposal for Berkhamsted has over 90% of the total proposed numbers along the South East edge of the town, with almost 900 houses off or using one single route - Shootersway/Kingshill Way, atop the hill, on one side of the Berkhamsted valley. There is no proposal or even attempt to increase road access from these locations to the town, schools or other activities.</li> <li>2 Regarding Road structure, including junctions and car parks: the published Transport Plan seems to be a contracted-out desk top survey, which does nothing to suggest how any huge number increase could work. It recognises the topography of the town and the valley nature; also the existing narrow streets, due to the many centuries of civic life here - it offers NOTHING, as a suggestion of how changes could be made to accommodate the proposed number of additional houses, population and cars.</li> <li>3 Transport system - there is no suggestion that any additional public transport would provide a useable method of transporting new residents to town, schools or leisure facilities, meaning an inevitable increase in private car traffic</li> <li>4 School places - a number of new primary schools and an additional secondary school would be needed but the evidence of committed provision by the County Council is not in evidence. The proposed site for a secondary school in Darrs Lane is at the opposite end of town from the major developments and would involve children walking on un-paved roads, on single track roads and steep hills.</li> <li>5 Sports facilities - the town is already underprovided with sports and leisure facilities and the proposal actually uses one significant site for a further 150 houses. The ability of the authority to compel the completion of space and leisure services, already planned has been poor, as the Bearroc Park developments show. The option to link a</li> </ol>

single major housing site with new sports facilities and two schools, as proposed in the Bulbourne Cross development was not taken forward - this is disappointing.

- 6 Medical services - the town has only two group practices, just coping with the current population. No discussion has taken place with the CCG on how additional planned numbers could adequately be dealt with. The total absence of any acute hospital facility, west of Watford has not been addressed
- 7 Local Employment opportunities - very limited currently and no new ideas discussed
- 8 Shops and services - The capacity of the existing town centre shops is not infinite - just two supermarkets and one "metro". There is no option for any new out-of-town facility and the new planned store, at Gossoms End, by Lidl and mentioned in the reports, has been owned with planning permission for over four years. The company has no current plans to complete this development. The capacity of the existing food shops has been evident during the Covid times, when queuing has been enforced; how would 2000 more families fit in?

In conclusion, may I say that the whole principle of the Local Plan has not been achieved and has merely provided a ready canvas for developers and landowners to set out their stall. Without the possibility to provide adequate and timely infrastructure to cope with the numbers, we should move to more suitable locations within the Borough where infrastructure already exists and/or can be more easily expanded. DBC must also succeed in persuading Central Government that the currently discussed numbers - now over 1000 new homes per year - are impossible to accommodate within the existing town structure and would go against their own declared Green Belt protection policies.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14144

**Person ID** 1163439

**Full Name** Lindy Weinreb

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

It is manifestly the case that the infrastructure of Berkhamsted is not fit for purpose in relation to current needs let alone any future housing development of the scale proposed by this Draft Plan.

I refer in particular to:

Town Centre Junctions and congestion; with only one crossing in the town centre, HCC transport studies are clear there is no scope for new roads or widening in central Berkhamsted. The traffic lights perform at 'over capacity' at busy periods.

Water and Sewage capacity; with the need to maintain the unique chalk streams in the area, the Environment Agency has capped abstraction from the local aquifer at current levels. The Sustainable Assessment identifies the need for additional capacity for the Borough as early as 2031.

Medical and Social Care; the Plan makes no provision for additional local GP services, nor for Social or Dementia Care in Berkhamsted. I recognize that these services are not the remit of the Planning Authority but adequate and sound Public Health provision must not fall between the cracks of HCC/CCG/PHE.

Schools: I note the potential provision of new Primary Schools, while a new 6FE Secondary School is posited on Site BK 06 in Northchurch. Capital Funding to build the school is unlikely to be sourced from a single development: additional revenue funding will be needed until its roll can attract funding to be sustainable. This must be identified in the IDP.

Infrastructure Development Plan: The Draft Plan references 'Masterplans' to guide development of major sites. Notable for their absence are proposals that link or integrate the sites with the host community viz roads/walking/cycling/footpaths together with prospective costs which must be included in the respective IDP.

Comments on the Consultation Questions follow on the next pages.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14151
<b>Person ID</b>	1163439
<b>Full Name</b>	Lindy Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The context is set out in the following text from p224 of the Draft Plan In our comments to Q1, I have stated a number of issues that lead us to our position As recognised in Para 23.119 [Page 225] the Town experiences a high level of congestion



The following paragraph says: “there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town”. As a town set in a valley with only one main crossing, the county’s engineers comment that the traffic lights already operate at over capacity, with residents choosing to avoid the main roads in the town centre or travelling to shop elsewhere. Alternative routes are unlikely to be capable of being widened without very costly investment.

The Draft Plan continues:23.121

The last sentence is an aspiration without a foundation to support it: the Plan offers no substantive detail that necessary strategic infrastructure or sustainable transport options, to provide access to the town centre and station, from the proposed development sites, other than by car, have been planned for.

The referenced ‘Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy’ [Para 23.122] is nothing of the sort, mapping as it does junction enhancements at relatively minor side roads and crossings within the urban area and new/ widened footpaths along Shootersway.

I also note the paragraph that refers to the town being served by a “key inter-urban Aylesbury – Hemel – Watford bus route”. Whilst the presence of said bus route – route 500 operated as a commercial service by Arriva - is correct, it operates at a frequency of 3 buses per hour on Monday-Friday, 2 buses per hour on Saturdays and 1 bus per hour on Sunday shopping hours. There is no evening service or early service on Saturdays. Due to its length, it also suffers from reliability issues. Despite fulfilling the criteria of a “good public transport service” in the Topic papers, there is the paucity of services in other directions from Berkhamsted. I do not agree that a sustainable transport network is in place in Berkhamsted.

The Policy SP21 [p229] states: (PARAGRAPH 1, 2 POLICY DM21)

Given recent experiences of applications that bear no resemblance to Master Plans [although adopted as SPD] residents will remain wary of such assurances.

The Introduction to the topic [Chapter 23, p 189] asserts:

“If this Draft Plan proceeds as set out, Berkhamsted residents will want to be assured that details for the key infrastructure needs to integrate the edge of town sites will be published prior to consultation on the Regulation 19 final plan.”

The Appendix attached comments on the critical importance of planning road and transport links at the outset so that residents have easy access to convenient options other than using their car.

### **West Berkhamsted**

While residents are concerned about the shortage of school places at secondary level in particular, the sustainability and viability of the secondary school will be under great pressure for many years until pupil numbers attract the funding to sustain the level of staffing provision necessary to support the school. This has not been addressed in the Draft Plan or IDP.

It is manifest that transport movements will add to congestion on Shootersway while Darrs Lane, a narrow country lane, will require major investment to support the additional traffic. Increased traffic on Darrs Lane will also intensify congestion in Northchurch village centre.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14162
<b>Person ID</b>	1163439
<b>Full Name</b>	Lindy Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted is a beautiful town, ideal commuting distance from London. But it has the challenge of its location. It is set in a relatively steep valley which rises over 60m from the bottom of the valley to the top. The main road up the valley, forms the high street through the town. The Railway station is near the centre of the town. There are not many alternative roads to the high street, to get from one end of the town to the other. There are few radial roads. So for most journeys from the periphery of the town, to any other part of town it is necessary to go through the centre. The result is the main junction in the town is regularly grid locked in rush hour.</p> <p>The centre of the town was built in the 19th century. With narrow streets and no off-street parking. In the 20th Century the town continued to expand until the periphery is no longer in walking distance of the centre.</p> <p>There are no natural routes for new roads to relieve this. The existing roads are not capable of handling the existing traffic.</p> <p>Future development</p> <p>There are proposals to build 2,200 new houses on the edge of town. Most of these will be large family houses which will not be affordable on local wages.</p> <p>No explanation has been provided as to how the town's road and transport system will be able to cope with the resultant journeys that will be generated which will result in a further 13,200 car journeys a day according to 'Trics' (Trip Rate Information Computer System).</p> <p>I am committed to the conservation of the historic built environment of Berkhamsted. This includes Northchurch, its internal green spaces and the retention of the surrounding and integral Green Belt which protects them. Green Belt is the single most important buffer against the coalescence of settlements, the erosion of which will threaten Berkhamsted's distinctive and discrete nature if this Plan is adopted as it stands. I am also deeply concerned about our canal environment. Dacorum is unique in that it has the Grand Union Canal running throughout the whole authority. It is a green lung, an</p>

invaluable asset affording easy access to our waterway heritage. Development on it's banks removes an irreplaceable visual amenity afforded by this public open space both to our local community and tourism.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14165

**Person ID** 1270549

**Full Name** Xavier Pashley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I'm 18 and I think you have no idea what the future generations want.

If you think we want to have our greenbelt land used for housing, you are wrong. We don't want thousands of houses.

We have loads of houses advertised in all the estate agents.

What we want is fields and countryside and careers in farming, near our homes. We want to be able to sleep at night without the noise of traffic and breathe clean air.

What you seem to want is money through ruining what is already a limited thing. Land. Greenbelt land.

Unfortunately for us who are younger and don't seem to have a voice, the majority of us don't much care about money and houses. What we do care about is the environment and the climate but people like you want to ruin it.

Northchurch is a village, it's not Berkhamsted and the Darrs Lane development is a dumb idea. Have you lived on (address removed) ? It's a nightmare. It's mayhem and the road should be a one way street.

Have you walked up Bell Lane and Darrs Lane? They are really old roads with old hedges and won't take all the traffic.

Have you walked to the wishing tree? It's my childhood and the view should not be a memory for others like me.

I have attached some recordings of the sound of the A41 from (address removed) where my mum lives. The first one is early morning . The A41 on a Monday morning (and this is in lockdown remember) is loud. The second recording is on a Sunday evening. You can hear traffic but not as loud. More cars means more noise means more fumes means more illness and climate change through emissions.

The amount of houses you want to build is stupid. We need our green fields, so your houses- if you really have to build them (don't think you do- look at how many estate agents we have in Berko) stick them on the majestic wine site, in the spare car parks. Not on greenbelt land. I want the land to stay for my kids and you don't have any right to take that away from me. You can tell that to Taylor Wimpey and your government.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14207

**Person ID** 1270563

**Full Name** FIONA SAUNDERS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation as attached.

To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14227

**Person ID** 1270582

**Full Name** NADIA LUPO

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** — I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted. This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14232

**Person ID** 1145687

**Full Name** Mrs Polly Walker

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The beautiful countryside surrounding Berkhamsted and Northchurch provides the foundations to some of the most important pillars of my life, that of my young family, and the community around us. Our mental health and physical wellbeing rely on the green open spaces that surround us, and many of our hobbies and pastimes are dedicated to the nature, the wildlife and the history living in it. Our eldest daughter is becoming an avid nature photographer – a hobby and potentially a career that she can pursue within yards of our home. Our youngest daughter a keen ‘treasure hunter’ – never appearing from a country walk without collections of animal skulls, bird eggs, remnants of owl pellets, deer antlers, fossils and ancient pottery... to name a few. She is already an aspiring archaeologist at the age of 8, a passion discovered and harnessed during long wanderings in the fields near our home. My husband and I lose ourselves in long country walks and runs through the surrounding countryside, the woodland and the hills, that are accessible by foot, and rely on these periods of escape in our local area more than any exotic holiday abroad. We are quite simply taken aback each day by the incredible views surrounding us, the frequent sightings of foxes, badgers, owls, mice, as well as a plethora of bird life – all within the fields and hedgerows neighbouring our house. The Bearroc Park development is already encroaching on this habitat, and whilst areas of brown belt in the local area remain unused and underdeveloped, we feel that it would be a scandal to build on protected greenbelt land, an area of outstanding natural beauty, with mass developments around Aylesbury and Hemel Hempstead threatening to swallow up Tring and Berkhamsted completely. Berkhamsted is regarded as a historic market town, a place of history and beautiful countryside, of close community. By continuing the cycle of ongoing development the rural feel to our beautiful town, the community way of life, the nature and our open spaces face permanent destruction.</p> <p>I fear that pursuing these ill thought proposals will have a catastrophic and irreversible impact on the town of Berkhamsted, it’s people and community, and the magnificent countryside that we are fortunate enough to be able to immerse ourselves in and urge you to consider alternative redevelopment opportunities instead.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14260
<b>Person ID</b>	1152075
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Wakely
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">14260-1.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14272
<b>Person ID</b>	1270626
<b>Full Name</b>	ADAM KEAR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14286
<b>Person ID</b>	1270629
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Bray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Sponsorship & Fundraising Tring Rugby Club
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14293
<b>Person ID</b>	1270631
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON LEGG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Choosing to deliver this plan by over developing our valuable green belt land is not justified or well thought out. Northchurch is a conservation area and next to the Ashridge NT estate, an area of AONB There should be very careful and justified development of this area, not the reckless development as set out in your plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14307
<b>Person ID</b>	1270634
<b>Full Name</b>	JANE AND CHRIS SAUNDERS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Re: Opposition of Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038

To whom it may concern,

I am writing as a Berkhamsted resident to object strongly to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth.

The Dacorum Local Plan proposes 16,899 across the borough. This is a significantly large number of new houses, and in our opinion is simply not justified and does not fall in line with actual requirements. The latest projections from the Office of National Statistics says that 335 dwellings per year for Dacorum are required, but the local plan is putting forward for 922.

Berkhamsted is a historic market town, the fact that it has been ringfenced to play a pivotal role in delivering the growth is unwarranted.

Many of the proposed dwellings for Berkhamsted and Northchurch are earmarked to be built on Green Belt land. We have read consistently in the media the directive from central Government that protection of the Green Belt must be paramount. So, to plan housing development on Green Belt land in and around Berkhamsted seems hugely contradictory. The plans would destroy the character of the town. The infrastructure cannot take more traffic, more sewage, and more light pollution.

The loss of our natural open countryside views would be lost forever to the detriment of us and our future generations. The plans will see the town of Berkhamsted merge into nearby towns and villages. If these dwellings go ahead the unique characteristics of the town will be destroyed. Berkhamsted will no longer be the small town that we love and live in.

I trust that the above objections will be taken fully into account.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14344

**Person ID** 1270640

**Full Name** Geoffrey Llewellyn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I note and agree with BRAG's analysis of the Government's clear support for the protection of the Green Belt. This set of policies is completely contravened by DCB's statements.</p> <p>What BRAG says about Hemel Hempstead is particularly worrying because it implies that DBC is <b>losing</b> an opportunity to regenerate and develop Hemel Hempstead while ruining the environs of Berkhamsted, and Tring by extensive building on the outskirts far from transport, schools, shops and services.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14355
<b>Person ID</b>	1270641
<b>Full Name</b>	WILLIAM ALLEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The developments to the West of Berkhamsted will subsume Northchurch within Berkhamsted and it will lose its distinctiveness as a community. Such coalescence should be avoided and to lose landscapes such as the wishing tree field will deny Northchurch of its on-going relationship with surrounding countryside - something which is essential for a community to retain its 'villageness'.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14365
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Borough has ambitious plans for employment growth but has insufficient suitable land for such development and while Berkhamsted is not an Employment Growth Area it is counter-intuitive to allocate the Jewson employment site in Billet Lane for residential development. A similar point is made about the British Film Institute site. DCB must allocate sites for hot-desking and similar co-working areas and sites for manufacture. Otherwise this Borough becomes a commuter town only, which is not a sustainable policy.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14374
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Berkhamsted in particular already suffers a serious shortage of football pitches, there are no tennis courts, no publicly available table tennis areas and very little other recreational provision outside paid for clubs. The Plan has nothing to offer. Indeed, it appears to put housing before any other consideration although it acknowledges that there are already inadequacies in provision. Take for example Haslam Fields. These should be open for use for recreation by the public as the benefactors wished not given as a windfall housing development to Berkhamsted School.</p> <p>Haslam Field (BK03) is a sports ground owned by Berkhamsted School, which has been an important part of the Town since 1541. Haslam Field was gifted to the school and, at a meeting with the school's Headmaster around the time of</p>

the Core Strategy inquiry, BRAG was told by the school that it was a legal condition that they could not develop the land – it was gifted to be used as sports fields.

Presumably, the school have found a legal way round these conditions, but clearly at the very least promoting the land goes directly against the spirit of the gift and the benefactors stated wishes, while BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. If the pitches are “surplus to requirements” to the school, they are clearly not to the community. It is very much needed by the community and should be protected by any council that has the interests of its residents at heart.

The policy on Haslam fields also draws another unpalatable comparison with Hemel Hempstead where the provision of open recreational space is huge by comparison. Its under-used too, while in Berkhamsted there is scarcely any provision at all.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14376

**Person ID** 1270640

**Full Name** Geoffrey Llewellyn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I quote from BRAG’s excellent summary “Policy SP1 really isn’t worth the paper it is written on. Thus far the Council has failed to hold developers to agreed Masterplans to the detriment of both the development and community , while points 1 to 8 simply rolls out statements that are little more than aspirational catchphrases, such as “successful new communities”, “best approach to”, “best practice”, “comprehensive green infrastructure”, “multifunctional space”, “an exemplar in sustainable living” etc. etc. etc. BRAG particularly takes issue with “5. promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy.” As highlighted elsewhere, the Transport Strategy is anything but sustainable and merely tinkers at the edges with minor junction amendments in Berkhamsted, while building on steep valley sides and ridge tops at a distance from the town centre/facilities that cannot and will not promote walking, cycling or public transport.”

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14379
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It is important to note that the Core Strategy (endorsed by Councillors) rejected a number of sites in Berkhamsted giving detailed reasons for rejection – yet now Dacorum Planning are ignoring their own robust reasons and arguments for rejection simply on the basis that there is a target to hit. The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good.</p> <p>BRAG. Have provided detailed comments on this which I fully support.</p> <p>The local objective to “Support the British Film Institute to consolidate on their site” has clearly been dropped. Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14404
<b>Person ID</b>	1270653
<b>Full Name</b>	NEIL BRANCH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The majority of the proposed development site lie on the outskirts of the town and would therefore likely leave new residents with little option to drive into town to shop/socialise and even commute. theroutes into town from the proposed sites would be through narrow, residential and already congested streets. Additional housing would create hazardous amounts of traffic and increased noise and pollution.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14405
<b>Person ID</b>	1270653
<b>Full Name</b>	NEIL BRANCH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	the nature of the geography of berkhamsted, the fact that it lies in a valley, limits the scope for a new road infrastructure. currently many of the proposed sites are accessed by small narrow country lanes, without significant changes to the feeder roads into town, the local roads simply could not cope with the increased traffic the development would create. The level of road development required would have a detrimental effect on not just the immediate surrounding area but further reaching areas beyond Berkhamsted
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14437
<b>Person ID</b>	1270665
<b>Full Name</b>	Cllr Stephen Claughton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>A housing target imposed by central Government on the basis of out-of-date estimates of household growth cannot be considered an objectively assessed need for the area and is not an exceptional circumstance to release the Green Belt.</p> <p>In its Transport Proposals, the Council says: “We are continuing to develop the transport proposals that will be included within the Plan. ... The exact transport interventions and the timing of delivery will be detailed in the next stage of the Plan”. This is unacceptable, given that the next stage will be the final, formal consultation, the responses to which will be passed to the Planning Inspectorate, but will not change the Plan as drafted.</p> <p>It is also unrealistic, given that the Berkhamsted Movement section records that: “As a settlement area, the County Council consider that Berkhamsted already has a sustainable transport network in place. ... However, they identify congestion as a key challenge in Berkhamsted resulting in constrained roads, difficulties with bus movements, and limited cycling infrastructure.” The Plan itself admits that: “There are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town”. It goes on to say that: “The careful location of new development and promoting opportunities for sustainable travel, will in part help tackle a number of parking and traffic issues.” But only in part.</p> <p>Saying that “All Growth Areas will be required to provide for on and off-site measures to alleviate local highway problems” is meaningless if—as the Council admits—there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town. The transport infrastructure measures set out in the Berkhamsted Allocations section are written mainly in terms of junction improvements, which won’t address the problem of congestion in the centre of the town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14465
<b>Person ID</b>	1270669
<b>Full Name</b>	Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delivery strategy set out in Policy SP19 (Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted and Policy SP21 (Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted) is supported in relation to the proposed allocation of Land at East of Darr's Lane (site reference: Bk06) for approximately 200 new homes and in respect of bringing forward growth in Berkhamsted in a cohesive manner to promote high-quality, sustainable design as well as a coordinated approach infrastructure delivery, land uses and to addressing key challenges such as mitigating for climate. However, whilst the need for appropriate and coordinated masterplanning of West Berkhamsted to achieve these aims is recognised, it is considered unnecessary to seek to achieve this through the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</li> <li>• The adoption of such an SPD is likely to be a time-intensive process and is considered unnecessary given the scale of the proposed growth area. The prompt delivery of the proposed allocations is going to be essential to meet the Borough's significant housing requirements and make a meaningful contribution to housing delivery in the early years of the Plan period and the Council should therefore strive to ensure housing can come forward as early as practicable following adoption of the New Local</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey consider that a more appropriate way to agree the masterplanning approach to the West Berkhamsted Growth Area is through an approved masterplan contained within a 'light-touch' Vision Document or Concept Framework Document prepared by the landowners/developers. This would set out the context, constraints/opportunities, present a clear vision for the Growth Area and set out a spatial In doing so, the landowners/developers would work with the Council to agree key details such as the number of dwellings on each site, any necessary infrastructure and the approach to open space and linkages between the sites. The benefit of such an approach is that the Council would still be able to input into a masterplanning exercise but that this would allow the sites to come forward promptly following adoption of the local plan without the need to then progress an SPD.</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey have already engaged with neighbouring landowners/developers whose sites are proposed for allocation in the West Berkhamsted Growth Area and all parties are proactive in their desire to have meaningful engagement with the Council to begin work on the masterplanning exercise following the conclusion of this consultation. If the Council are amenable, the landowners/developers would look to prepare a Vision Document/Concept Framework document ahead of the Regulation 19 Consultation. Working to such a timetable would allow the Council to be in a position to endorse the final masterplan in parallel with the Local Plan-making process, which may also give the Local Plan Inspector comfort that the key objectives of the site allocations can</li> </ul>

be achieved, and in advance of the development management process to ensure the swift delivery of sites as soon as practicable following the adoption of the New Local Plan.

- It is noted that the draft Policy wording for Growth Area Bk06 requires the delivery of a new public park, incorporating Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to offset recreational impacts on the Chiltern Beechwoods The supporting text to SP21 further refers to the key development requirements to be delivered at West of Berkhamsted as including the provision of a network of green spaces, including the delivery of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), if required. The objective of delivering a comprehensive network of green spaces is supported in principle, and indeed will likely be essential in order to address the challenges of climate change and ensuring biodiversity net gain. However, we are not aware of current evidence to suggest that visitor pressure on the SAC is currently, or in the future, likely to adversely affect the conservation objectives or integrity of the SAC designated land and we do not therefore support the policy requirement to deliver SANG. Further, a requirement on site allocations to deliver SANG has the potential to significantly reduce the number of dwellings that the existing site allocations could deliver. The above considered, Taylor Wimpey are of the view that policy compliant on-site public open space / a public park is sufficient in this location and will adequately meet open space requirements.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14486

**Person ID** 1270672

**Full Name** ICP Asset Management Ltd

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The Delivery Strategy for Berkhamsted must include a specific requirement to meet the needs of the ageing population.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS14498
<b>Person ID</b>	1173484
<b>Full Name</b>	Crest Nicholson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Policy SP20 ('Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted') identifies the site as a 'major urban extension', allocated for around 80 dwellings, with public open</li> <li>• Crest Nicholson strongly supports the inclusion of site Bk05 in the draft Local Plan,. It believes that the allocation is based on a robust evidence base and that the site will play a meaningful role in contributing to the required housing supply, notably in the short-term as the site is able to be brought forward in these timescales due to its lack of constraints. Development would also provide benefits in the form of contributions towards much needed affordable housing in the local area.</li> <li>• The site provides sustainable access to key facilities and travel destinations via foot, bicycle and public transport, making it an ideal site to bring forward for residential</li> <li>• The site can play a significant role in contributing to a strong local economy, through direct and indirect employment creation, resident spending in the town and contributions to local infrastructure and services. These merits will contribute considerably to the draft policy objectives of supporting a prosperous economy in the</li> <li>• It is however noted that the indicative masterplan discussed above, which has been prepared for the site on behalf of Crest Nicholson, presents an effective development concept for the site for up to 95 homes. This is still considered to be a modest size development, in-keeping with Berkhamsted's place in the Settlement Hierarchy. The review of the housing strategy in Section 2 of this report, acknowledges that the housing numbers in the draft Local Plan are yet to be finalised, and therefore it is considered that the proposed housing figure for both Berkhamsted and the individual site allocations within (notably Bk05), are likely, and able, to accommodate a modest uplift to reflect the future housing need figure for DBC. Such an uplift is all the more relevant in the context of the subsequent revisions to the Governments assessment for housing need within</li> <li>• The site Bk05 forms part of the large-scale extension (on separate sites) west of Berkhamsted which will create a new neighbourhood, which in total includes around 500 homes, primary schools, a new secondary school, a district heating network and a network of green spaces including the delivery of Sustainable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) if</li> </ul>

- Policy SP22 ('Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted') states that a Masterplan will be prepared for the West of Berkhamsted by the Council (in collaboration with key partners and landowners) and adopted as an The Masterplan will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes which will inform planning applications.
- Crest Nicholson supports a Masterplanning led approach to developing West Berkhamsted in principle, as it will enable the delivery of a well-connected, cohesive urban extension to However, it is important that this approach should not delay site allocations that are deliverable in the short term.
- When looking at site Bk05 in the context of the West Berkhamsted Masterplan Area, it is apparent that the site is relatively small in size compared to some of the other sites that form the Masterplan Area, and lacks direct connectivity with all but one of the other proposed allocations. The site is located at the periphery of the Masterplan Area, and is not reliant on any other sites to come forward, nor does it share any infrastructure requirements. The site has many merits when considered in isolation from the Masterplan Area, as discussed above, notably that it is able to come forward in the short term (0-5 years).
- Crest Nicholson therefore suggest that the Council may wish to consider the merits of a Concept Framework document as a visioning exercise for the West Berkhamsted Area in place of a formal SPD approach. A Concept Framework could demonstrate that the Growth Area is robust and deliverable whilst not delaying the delivery of sites early in the plan
- Nevertheless, Crest Nicholson is keen to work with adjoining landowners, developers and the Council, and will ensure any development brought forward does not prejudice other sites coming forward within the West Berkhamsted
- Crest Nicholson is also willing to develop the indicative masterplan for site Bk05 with consideration of the intentions for any Development Parcel Design Code being prepared as part of the West Berkhamsted Masterplan led approach.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14530

**Person ID** 1270690

**Full Name** Akzo Nobel CIF Nominees Ltd

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

In respect to the Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy, our client supports the overall ambitions of the strategy (Policy SP20) and namely the protection of Berkhamsted town centre and its historic environment and the delivery of at least 2,236 homes. CBRE support the allocation of Berkhamsted Town Centre (Bk16) as a renewal area to ensure its future regeneration and diversification.

The Council should amend paragraph 23.104 (page 224) to read at least “2,236 homes” not “2,200 homes” for accuracy. The Council must also ensure Policy SP20 satisfies the necessary soundness tests and therefore if this policy is to be deemed “consistent with national policy” (paragraph 35 of the NPPF) it should the start as minimum to ensure opportunities for further housing growth are not precluded in interests of significantly boosting housing supply in accordance with paragraph 59 of the NPPF.

Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted is capable of delivering circa 80 new homes either through a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment or managed later-living development and in either of these development scenarios would deliver a significant amount of the 217 new homes earmarked to come from newly identified/windfall sites. This Site is in a prominent and sustainable location, within the town centre boundary and benefits from good access to public transport. Redevelopment of this Site would be of a high design quality, conserve the appearance of Berkhamsted Conservation Area and adjacent heritage assets and would further contribute to the long-term vitality and viability of Berkhamsted Town Centre.

These representations confirm Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted Site should be allocated for a mixed-use allocation in the next iteration of the Local Plan either for a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment comprising circa 80 new homes, including affordable housing and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace; or a managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common “clubhouse” leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level. The Site is suitable for a mix of such residential or residential institution, retail, leisure and community uses, and is available and deliverable in the short-term.

In order for the Plan to be robust and satisfy the appropriate policy tests to be found sound, consideration should be given to the appropriate allowance for any possible delays in housing delivery, particularly in relation to large scale strategic sites dependent upon new infrastructure to facilitate growth. The Council should therefore prioritise the delivery of suitable, available and deliverable sites in urban areas that are capable of delivering significant number of market and affordable housing or later-living housing such as Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted.

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS14764
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>The Council will bring forward a comprehensively planned urban extensions to Berkhamsted in accordance with a Masterplan led approach and based on the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) Garden City Principles. The <b>Illustrative Masterplan</b> will be prepared by the <b>respective landowners/developers in consultation with the Council</b> and <del>adopted as an SPD working in collaboration with</del> and key partners and landowners and be subject to community and stakeholder involvement. <b>This will form part of a Concept Framework Document which will provide design and place-making guidance to support the planning application process.</b></i></p> <p><i>The <b>Illustrative Masterplan will inform the outline and/ or hybrid applications per Growth Area with design codes as a conditional requirement to these planning approvals to inform the more detailed design stages</b> <del>will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes which will inform planning applications:</del></i></p> <p><i>The Masterplan (and other supporting documents) will set out how the <del>South Berkhamsted extensions will deliver the following:</del> The South Berkhamsted extensions will deliver the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <i>distinctive, sustainable, high quality, successful new communities with a best approach to planning, design and management of the built and public</i></li> <li>2 <i>achieves best practice in design to build in sustainable lifestyles, such as walkable neighbourhoods with local services and employment opportunities throughout the development.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <i>beautifully and imaginatively designed homes, combining the best of town and country to create healthy</i></li> <li>2 <i>a comprehensive green infrastructure network and net biodiversity gains which enhances the environment.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>The development will deliver local and strategic green infrastructure designed as accessible multifunctional</i></p> </li> </ol>

- space and maximise benefits such as wildlife, recreation, water management and includes opportunities to grow
- 3 promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport
  - 4 an exemplar in sustainable living with a particular focus on reducing energy consumption as well as generating energy from renewable and low carbon sources and delivering other significant environmental enhancement to ensure climate
  - 5 **contribute to the delivery** the infrastructure requirements set out in the Dacorum Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan for
  - 6 deliver all other site specific requirements set out in the proposed allocation(s) Bk01, Bk02, Bk03, Bk04, BK09,

*The landowners/developers Council will prepare the **Illustrative** Masterplan for the whole of the South Berkhamsted Urban Extension Growth Area and this will be adopted as an SPD. The **Illustrative** Masterplan **will form part of a Concept Framework** will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes which will inform subsequent planning applications. These will be prepared in collaboration **with the Council**, key partners and landowners and be supported and be subject to by community and stakeholder involvement, **where appropriate**.*

Whilst the proposed reforms to the planning system to include the implementation of a more zonal approach to land uses are recognised and DBC's allocation of Growth Areas supported, in the interests of the shared objective to speed up the delivery of homes, it is essential that the planning process does not unduly delay delivery. A number of amendments are therefore proposed to this draft Policy in seeking to ensure a coordinated approach which is consistent with the site specific requirements of the Growth Area allocations.

Please refer to Savills' Planning Document (February 2021) for detailed commentary on these proposed amendments, as formally submitted as part of the planning representations and set out under Section 6.

#### Included files

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14766

**Person ID** 1207558

**Full Name** Ms Jane Barnett

**Organisation Details** Director

Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills -Planning Document 26.02.21.doc</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14809
<b>Person ID</b>	1264510
<b>Full Name</b>	Martin Evening
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>7. The Dacorum DLP does not include strategy for providing additional employment capacity in Berkhamsted and Northchurch. With the proposed 1,800+ houses growth in just this area, we must assume that must mean more out-commuting as a percentage of population?</p> <p>Not planning for more jobs in our area will result in it becoming a dormitory/commuting town to feed the wider area. Commuting levels will increase at a higher rate than the population growth, with added journey lengths and congestion with all the problems I stated above on car usage.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14817



<b>Person ID</b>	1270802
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Edward Blogg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The sites do not meet sustainability assessment requirements as set by Dacorum BC. The sites conflict with Dacorum’s own plan policies.</p> <p>Bk07 – Lock Field – shown be delisted. It is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The infrastructure demands to absorb this population growth have been ignored.</p> <p>Site design proposals (SPD’s) have not been drafted, so no details what proposed in depth for each site’</p> <p>Have not considered that “Shootersway” be considered as one overall neighbourhood “community” development – not 7 separate, non-contiguous sites, where separate developer objectives would deliver sub optimal social outcomes.</p> <p>That the plan to date has insufficiently covered the social isolation impacts of these sites, in particular sites Bk06 and Bk08, and how these sites can best be fully absorbed into the community. No real attempt, or acceptance of commitments, to finding supporting transport solutions for these new, dispersed sites has been forthcoming, e.g. bus services.</p> <p>As presented the Draft Local Plan does not address for the existing population how their existing social assets and facilities will be maintained and not overwhelmed. How, as far as is practical, will existing quality of life standards be protected, maintained, and where shortfalls currently exist that they would be addressed.</p> <p>will not seek to increase road capacity”. (Local Plan paras 21.17 and 23.120 refer)</p> <p>Attrition against car uses, by resisting road improvement and adding to congestion, makes life difficult for everyone. More congestion, traffic delays, parking problems will impact by default on all - pedestrians, cyclists, bus users, commercial road users et al.</p>

The Draft Local Plan is likely to create a “Catch 22”. Wasting resources by tinkering at edge and not addressing crux of the problems,

More car usage is unavoidable, if population / housing is to be expanded. Not expanding and remodelling road infrastructure are not an acceptable alternative. Dacorum’s approach is not in accord with Hertfordshire’s Transport Plan (LTP4).

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14867

**Person ID** 1145605

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details** Premier Property Acquisition

**Agent ID** 1145599

**Agent Full Name** Mr  
Jonathan  
Buckwell

**Agent Organisation** Director  
DHA Planning

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The emerging local plan strategy seeks to accommodate growth that supports the long- term function of the towns and villages and delivers sufficient growth to provide much needed investment in infrastructure. The Council recognises that to accommodate all the growth needed and so to meet their objectively assessed need, they will need to release land in the Green Belt.

The Growth Strategy for Berkhamsted seeks to maximise urban capacity but does not pursue an urban intensification strategy that would detract from the character of the location. The Council is therefore seeking to accommodate expansions to the settlement in a way that manages landscape and Green Belt impacts but also meets the tests of sustainability. Berkhamsted is identified as needing to accommodate at least 2,200 homes over the plan period.

DHA and our client are supportive of the broad strategy for growth in Berkhamsted and the Council's pro-active approach with regard to Green Belt and meeting the housing needs of the town.

In compiling the emerging Local Plan, the Council have procured an evidence base intended to support and inform the development strategy. In doing so the Council states that they have completed an assessment of potential greenfield sites that could come forward and assessed the suitability of such sites. For Berkhamsted the Council are proposing a series of strategic urban extensions on land on the south and western edges of Berkhamsted and up to the A41 made up of several small and large developments which are predicted to deliver around 1,870 homes.

Given the identified needs for Berkhamsted, it is not clear why the Council are only proposing to allocate c.1,870 homes in the emerging Local Plan which leaves a shortfall of 330 against the 2,200 required. Given the Council have acknowledged that an 'urban intensification strategy would detract from the character of the location' and the fact that the entire town is encircled by Green Belt (which significantly restricts the prospects of windfall sites) we are strongly of the opinion that the Council should allocate sufficient sites to meet the full objectively assessed of 2,200 for the plan period.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14894

**Person ID** 1144629

**Full Name** Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** Many of the comments elsewhere in the paper also are relevant to the Guiding Development policies. These comments are not repeated here.

In particular, SP20 (Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted) is not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3. SP22 (Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted) is not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3. ("*West Berkhamsted*" is essentially Northchurch, a village.)

SP23 (Delivering Growth in Tring) is likewise not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3.

See also Section 5 below for details of the adverse impact on the village of Northchurch and specific considerations relating to the Northchurch sites.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14896

**Person ID** 1144629

**Full Name** Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The development around Berkhamsted will disproportionately affect the village of Northchurch. Northchurch is a separate village (of around 2,500 residents) to Berkhamsted with its own Parish Council and a small historic centre. That fact is scarcely acknowledged by the Plan which simply treats Northchurch and the sites within it (including Bk06 and Bk07) as an extension of Berkhamsted, newly (and inappropriately) billed "*West Berkhamsted*"<sup>35</sup> and which refers to Berkhamsted (including Northchurch) as an "*urban*" area. By contrast, the Local Plan treats locations such as Markyate, Bovingdon and King's Langley - despite all of these locations having a larger population than Northchurch - as villages where concerns around sustainability, congestion and the restricted range of services and facilities mean that development should be limited.<sup>36</sup>

As discussed further below, previous Green Belt reviews have recognised that the area around Northchurch "*predominantly retains an unspoilt, rural character*" and have concluded that the areas of Green Belt around Northchurch fulfil their purposes, and in particular contribute "*significantly*"<sup>37</sup> towards "*preserving the setting and special character of historic towns*".<sup>38</sup> Permitting the development on sites Bk06 and Bk08 in particular will result in a loss of that special character for Northchurch (specifically mentioned in this regard in the Phase 1 Green Belt Review<sup>39</sup>), which currently retains its traditional character as a village nestled in the valley around its Saxon-origin church (one of the oldest in Hertfordshire). What has been less clearly noted, but is implicit in the Green Belt reviews to date is the risk of merger between South-West Berkhamsted and Northchurch (purpose (b) of the Green Belt purposes).<sup>40</sup> This outcome is a direct consequence of the current plans - At present there is open countryside between the South-West perimeter of Berkhamsted (represented by the "*hard edge*" of Durrants Lane).<sup>41</sup>

At present, Northchurch is known to suffer from air quality problems, and has a declared Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in the High Street, signifying that national air quality objectives are unlikely to be achieved. Adding extra traffic burdens to the village (which also has no excess parking capacity) will reverse the recent small improvements in the air quality recorded at that location.<sup>42</sup>

Like Berkhamsted generally, it also suffers from a lack of open space within the town.<sup>43</sup> In those circumstances, the public rights of way into the Green Belt countryside around Northchurch (such as that which runs off Bell Lane through site Bk06 - known by local residents as the 'Wishing Tree field' - see further below) are extremely valuable. The sudden decision by DBC in early 2020 to close all pedestrian access from South West Berkhamsted across the A41 has made such space still more important. While it is proposed that certain sites within the Plan (including Bk06) should include new public spaces within them, that is far inferior to the ability to gain direct access to the open countryside of the Green Belt. These proposed green spaces, which will inevitably be small, are a poor substitute for open country.

The following section focuses on three Green Belt sites in/close to Northchurch. The first two sites (Bk06 - East of Darrs Lane, and Bk08 - Rossway Farm) are prime examples of many of the general concerns raised above and have features which make them particularly unsuitable for development. The planned developments in these sites are described as "major urban extensions",<sup>44</sup> yet they currently are entirely rural in character, and do not directly abut to "urban" areas. The third site (Bk07 - Lock Field) has particular problems with access and safety which relate to its village location in Northchurch.

<sup>35</sup> Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 - 2038), p.230.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. pp.66, 247.

<sup>37</sup> SKM Report, Annex 1.1, p.20. Available at: [https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review\\_annex-1-1\\_dacorum\\_final.pdf?sfvrsn=d9afc89f\\_0](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review_annex-1-1_dacorum_final.pdf?sfvrsn=d9afc89f_0)

38 SKM Report, Part 2, para. 7.5.1-7.5.2, Figure 7.5, pp.49-50 and Annex 1.1 at p.22. Available at:

[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review\\_final-report-part2.pdf?sfvrsn=babc89f\\_0](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review_final-report-part2.pdf?sfvrsn=babc89f_0)

39 SKM Report, Annex 1.1, p.20.

40 NPPF, paragraph 134(b).

41 Green Belt Phase 2 Review (Arup Report), pp. A4 and 131.

42 Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, p.22: it is noted that there is only one 'normal' year (2019) of data in which the air quality at the location improved. Although DBC reported that NO2 concentrations remained below intervention limits in 2020, the periods of lockdown are likely to mean that the year is not representative.

43 Berkhamsted (including Northchurch) has the second lowest level of current provision in the borough. DBC Open Space Study Assessment Report, July 2019, Table 6.1 (p.31), [https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/open-space-study-assessment-report-july-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=f6e0c9e\\_4](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/open-space-study-assessment-report-july-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=f6e0c9e_4).

44 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.227.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14925

**Person ID** 1270586

**Full Name** RACHEL CHAPMAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I wish to place on record my whole hearted objection to the amount of housing Dacorum Council and the UK Government is placing on Berkhamsted and Tring.

My husband and I have been living in Berkhamsted for over 40 years and have loved living in this historic and ancient town surrounded by marvellous countryside and within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The amount

of housing Dacorum Council is planning for both Berkhamsted and Tring will ruin both towns and blight the lives of our local community.

**GREEN BELT** land - even the Government has said that Green Belt land should not be developed except in exceptional circumstances. As I understand it Berkhamsted and Tring in the recent past have exceeded the housing numbers required, whereas Hemel Hempstead has not.

Green Belt land should not be used for housing under any circumstances, it protects the boundaries of the various towns and villages and also in the case of Berkhamsted and Tring valuable farming land is going to be used. Surely as a country we should be self sufficient as much as we can be in food production, particularly as we are longer in the EU,

- and riot put up houses instead. We can't eat bricks and mortar.

During the pandemic, our lives have been dramatically changed and I suspect will continue to affect all of us for many, many years to come. People are mostly working from home, offices are now empty and the likelihood that we will return to the old way of working is highly improbable, or perhaps to much lesser degree. We mostly shop on line and shops are empty and shut, retail companies have gone into bankruptcy etc etc. Surely this brown field land can be used for providing homes including affordable ones instead ruining our lovely countryside.

I suspect that builders/building companies are keener to build in Barkhamsted or Tring for a far higher profit margin, instead of say Hemel Hempstead.

**INFRASTRUCTURE** in both Berkhamsted and Tring is a dire way now, let alone with an influx of many, many extra houses with a minimum of 2 cars per household. The lack of parking is not actually noticeable at present due only to the current pandemic and I suspect even with the provision of the multi-storey parking off Kings Road in Berkhamsted, it will not be sufficient (particularly as it only provides a few extra parking spaces than previously) once we return to a near normal life.

Schools and doctors' surgeries are full now. Water supplies, sewerage, electric and gas supplies could be impacted quite seriously, particularly water and sewerage. Roads appear to be in a permanent state of disrepair.

We are supposed to be going green but the bus service is not particularly good. Berkhamsted is in quite a steep valley with narrow streets so in fact buses can not easily travel everywhere. Before the pandemic there were constant traffic

jams in the centre of town, even now during the pandemic we can have traffic jams by the main traffic lights!! What on earth will it be like with 1000s more houses built in the future. The same can be said of Tring.

**PLEASE DO NOT RUIN OUR PRECIOUS AND HISTORIC MARKET TOWNS OF BERKHAMSTED AND TRING.**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14977

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

We would like to be consulted on the Masterplan for these areas.

We are pleased to see that a comprehensive green (and blue) infrastructure network will be enhanced including biodiversity net gain and water management which should specifically mention flood risk.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15019

**Person ID** 1270845

**Full Name** DOMINIC LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Policy SP20 (“Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted”) is not agreed, for the same reasons as given above in relation to policies SP2 and SP3.</b>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15087
<b>Person ID</b>	1261425
<b>Full Name</b>	Camilla Pascucci
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 The Dacorum DLP does not include strategy for providing additional employment capacity in Berkhamsted and Northchurch. With the proposed 1,800+ houses growth in just this area, we must assume that must mean more out-commuting as a percentage of population?</p> <p>Not planning for more jobs in our area will result in it becoming a dormitory/commuting town to feed the wider area. Commuting levels will increase at a higher rate than the population growth, with added journey lengths and congestion with all the problems I stated above on car usage.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15104

<b>Person ID</b>	1270925
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Kathryn Salway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Extinction Rebellion Dacorum
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlinked and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.</p>

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land. The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15114

**Person ID** 1270934

**Full Name** Mr Leonard Hussey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** The proposed developments in Northchurch will place an increasing burden on an already creaking infrastructure system so the numbers should be reduced across the area.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15142

**Person ID** 1270943

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details** NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please see the report to NPC dated 16 November 2020, which establishes the long standing concerns of Northchurch residents regarding road safety in the village.</p> <p>There are concerns that there appears to be no appreciation of the fact that Northchurch is a separate community to Berkhamsted with its own distinct identity. This suggests that the approach to Northchurch has been to view it from a desktop perspective, indicating a lack of awareness of the topography and particular character and challenges regarding road safety in Northchurch. This is of considerable concern as the road infrastructure in Northchurch is already significantly overburdened and there are very limited opportunities to improve it.</p> <p>The report from the Chair of the Road Safety Committee to the Northchurch Parish Council below, dated November 2020, describes the difficulties in the centre of the village; narrow pavements, often disappearing; historic overhanging housing; Victorian terraces on Northchurch High Street and cottages at the bottom of New Road, often occupied by families with young children, with front doors opening directly onto pavements and busy trunk roads - there is already considerable concern about congestion, road safety and pollution - these are long standing problems.</p> <p>The considerable development proposed for both Tring and Berkhamsted is likely to put an unacceptable burden on the road infrastructure along Northchurch High street; This is already a congested area with traffic often idling and backing up along the high street as buses wait at the bus stop on the High Street near the bottom of Darrs Lane. There is often congestion at the junction of Darrs Lane and the High street due to customers driving to the Tesco store. As a result this already creates pollution from idling traffic. DBC is already aware that this is an area of concern for pollution and monitoring of air quality already takes place. Given the high number of elderly households (including Compass Point) and of family homes on the high street, poor air quality this raises considerable public health concerns.</p> <p>Northchurch High Street is situated at the bottom of the Bulborne Valley. As such it is the only direct route between Berkhamsted and Tring. Both these towns have vibrant independent shops on their high streets. Berkhamsted Waitrose attracts customers from Tring and surrounding villages, whilst Tring's independent shopping attracts visitors from Berkhamsted.</p>

To double the population of Tring and add a similar number of houses across Berkhamsted will considerably increase (potentially double) the number of car journeys along Northchurch High Street. This is unacceptable and unsustainable. There is no scope for widening the roads or improving junctions of concern.

The narrow uneven footpaths and the high proportion of elderly people and families with young children means this increase in population of Tring and Berkhamsted will impose significant public health risk.

There is also concern about the safety of the junction between Tring Road and Dudswell Lane - there are frequent near misses and accidents reported here. This is a hairpin junction with a number of residential driveways opening on to it. A decision by DMC to refuse a development at this junction on the grounds of

road safety concerns was upheld by the PIN which noted the concerns of the Go20 road safety campaign and the motion unanimously passed in March 2018 by Hertfordshire County Council, which noted that there should be a review of road safety policies regarding the stretch of road between Pea Lane and Billet Lane.

There is a bus stop used by children and elderly at this point, with poor visibility, which has already featured as a matter of concern in several planning applications. It is noted that delivery vehicles travelling from the Tring direction turning into Dudswell Lane cannot execute this turn in a single manoeuvre, but have to reverse back into the main road across double white lines in order to proceed. This is already a hazardous junction and to increase traffic movements between Tring and Berkhamsted will inevitably increase the risk of to road safety of the many young and elderly pedestrians and cyclists who use this junction.

Northchurch Parish Council Road Safety Report. 16 November 2020

Author: Cllr Lara Pringle, chair of NPC Road Safety Committee *1/Background*

Road safety is an issue of high importance to many residents in Northchurch.

Northchurch was built long before the advent of modern transport. As a result the interface between pedestrians and road traffic is often quite problematic. There are difficulties with the main roads which have limited footpath provision. Footpaths often disappear, causing pedestrians to need to cross the road, or are narrow or uneven, causing people pushing prams to have to go onto the road to pass each other.

We have a primary school, playground, kindergarten and two churches. Many children walk home unaccompanied in dark school uniform. Many of our residents are families with young children or elderly and disabled people using mobility aids.

There is a great deal of public concern and support for improving road safety.

Many residents who are elderly or have young children report that they use cars to travel to the local amenities rather than go on foot, such is their concern over road safety. Fear over safety therefore generates car journeys, which becomes a self-perpetuating problem. Concerns around road safety need to be altered to encourage more journeys on foot.

### *2/Go20 Petition 2018*

In March 2018 a petition calling for a 20mph zone in Northchurch, signed by over two thousand Hertfordshire residents, was presented to Hertfordshire County Council. As a result, a motion was passed by HCC calling for a review of road safety in Northchurch (between Pea Lane and Billet Lane) and a review of the Hertfordshire speed management strategy. This motion was because, in the view of local representatives, the speed management strategy was insufficiently flexible, meaning that it impeded many road safety measures that would be supported by residents. Most specifically it defined Northchurch as a rural area, which limited 20mph zones.

The HCC motion and Go20 petition were successfully used as evidence in opposing a development on the grounds of road safety. The 2019 PIN report, which upheld the decision to refuse the development, despite lack of highways objection, referred specifically to the work of the Go20 group.

### *3/New Speed Management Strategy*

Herts County Council circulated a draft speed management policy for public consultation, between July and September 2020.

Cllr Pringle, having been delegated the responsibility, completed it on behalf of NPC. Cllr Pringle also circulated the policy to individual residents, including members of the Go20 group to complete. A member of Go20 also completed the survey on behalf of Go20.

The final strategy is still awaited and this will inform us of what may be possible for Northchurch going forward.

It should be noted that the draft policy seemed to give more flexibility for 20 mph zones around schools and also to Town and Parish Councils to fund appropriate measures.

#### *4/ Police and Crime Commissioner Funded Projects*

The Go20 group has made successful applications over the past two years for funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) in two spending rounds.

There are two projects:

- A gateway on the Tring Road entrance to Northchurch which is to alert traffic that they are entering a residential area. Match funding was agreed by the County Councillor from the locality fund.
  
- 1 A SID and gateway and child pedestrian warning sign on New Road, on the basis that the pavement is narrow and uneven and children can only walk in single file. This was clearly to calm the traffic coming into Northchurch.

In advance of the NPC Road Safety Committee meeting on 8 June 2020, Cllr Pringle made enquires about the progress on these projects in March 2020 and was informed that a new

Highways officer, Mike Jarrett, had been appointed for Northchurch. Mike Jarrett informed Cllr Pringle that he aimed to respond with an update by July 2020.

In July 2020, Cllr Pringle was informed that a new draft Speed Management Strategy had been opened for consultation until the end of September and the updates on the projects would follow.

Given the change of staff, Cllr Pringle checked with the office of the PCC as to the progress of the PCC funded projects. Cllr Pringle was informed that the funding was all guaranteed and that the PCC would instruct HCC to carry out the appropriate work.

Northchurch Parish Council Road Safety Committee met on 8 June 2020. Cllr Pringle updated on enquiries regarding the projects. Cllr Pringle suggested that the Highways officer could be invited to our next meeting.

Since the close of the Speed Management Strategy consultation, Cllr Pringle has again attempted to make contact with the Highways officer re the updates on the projects. Cllr Pringle understands that there has been some delay in similar projects across the county due to CV19.

6/ The Highways officer has informed Cllr Pringle within the last few weeks that there may be difficulty siting the SID on New Road for incoming traffic and that it is likely that it will be placed for traffic leaving Northchurch, on New Road. The SID should be in place by 31 March. This is not consistent with the original application, which was to protect vulnerable pedestrians on the pavement side, which is on the incoming side. Cllr Pringle has confirmed that the application was for incoming traffic with the resident in whose name the application was made on behalf of Go20.

Cllr Pringle will be suggesting a site visit with the Highways officer to discuss options for siting.

#### *7/Hamberlyns Lane tunnel*

There has been concern for some time about gatherings in the tunnel in Hamberlyns Lane. A local resident has contacted Cllr Pringle on several occasions. He litter picks on an individual voluntary basis and reported that he often finds nitrous oxide canisters in that location. During the first lockdown there were reports of engines revving and speeding in the area. It seems that the amplification of the sound in the tunnel may be part of the appeal. It was feared that vehicles were being revved or driven at speed under the influence of nitrous oxide.

This was reported to the community police officer and the details of the resident passed on for further investigation.

#### *8/ Speeding in New Road*

In addition to the general concerns about speeding in New Road, during lockdown there were numerous reports of speeding, particularly on motorbikes, on New Road and around Ashridge. A resident on New Road filmed someone speeding up and down and doing U-turns near the entrance to Sunnyside.

The biker then did a wheelie as he rode up New Road at speed.

This was reported to PC Hewitt, who was able to trace the registered keeper via the number plate. It turned out he had come all the way from Reading to enjoy the roads around Ashridge. He was given a warning and it is not thought that he has returned to Northchurch since. However, as in many other areas of the country, speeding became a widespread problem.



As a result of the concern over speeding in Northchurch, and the fact that Drivesafe volunteer activities and training has been

suspended due to CV19, Sgt Hewitt agreed to have some visible speed checks in Northchurch to deter offenders.

In addition to the above incident, local residents reported that a cyclist had been knocked off his bike on New Road, on the outward direction. An ambulance was called, but he was not seriously hurt, so there is some concern about speeding and road safety in both directions.

The hedge on New Road creating visibility issues is a perennial problem.

#### *9/Speeding on Darrs Lane*

We have had a number of reports of bollards being knocked down and vehicles speeding as cars enter Northchurch along Darrs Lane. This is of particular concern because of the poor visibility and the use of Darrs Lane as a route to school and by elderly residents. Also, there is no footpath for much of the area and many properties open directly onto the road. Cllr Somervail has been keen to make progress on traffic calming measures in Darrs Lane. A speed survey is under consideration by NPC.

#### *10/ Reports to NPC website*

Residents are always encouraged to report incidents to NPC website, even if they think it is a minor incident. It is always useful to have real examples of everyday incidents as evidence for seeking road safety measures. This facility should be published as much as possible and residents reminded of it when reporting concerns.

#### *11/ Drivesafe*

This is a volunteer activity organised by the police. Prior to lockdown there was some interest in training to be a Drivesafe volunteer and there was a presentation at NPC. Due to lockdown, all Drivesafe activities were suspended.

Once the CV19 restrictions are lifted, we can encourage training for Drivesafe to engage our residents in road safety activities.

#### *Summary*

There have been a number of individual improvements over the past few years (such as a playground warning sign near the rec; the SID at The Meads which was organised by Cllr Edwards; the children crossing sign on the road surface outside Bon Soirée) and we have some projects in progress. These have been delayed by a change in Highways officer, the consultation on the speed management strategy and CV19.

We have an active and engaged community who are helping to reinforce speed awareness by reporting incidents. We even have had some children make a home-made sign which is currently visible on New Road (Sgt Hewitt has commented that as long as such signs do not obstruct visibility or other signs, they can be very effective and are welcome).

Once the new Hertfordshire wide speed management strategy is finalised, it is important to engage with local residents, such as members of Go20, elderly residents, the school, parents and others to consider the opportunities for road safety improvement in Northchurch. We can establish our priorities through public engagement and liaison with Herts Highways. The Road Safety Committee would be the natural forum to enable this. All residents and NPC councillors are welcome to either join the committee or attend meetings on an occasional basis.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15152

**Person ID** 1270945

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details** NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Northchurch is not mentioned in the Delivery Strategy. Instead, Northchurch is referred to as ‘West Berkhamsted’: there is no such place as West Berkhamsted. The Delivery Strategy blurs the clear boundaries between two very different communities: Northchurch and Berkhamsted. Policy SP20 Table 35 Growth Areas describes the developments in and around Northchurch village as ‘major urban extension’. Berkhamsted is urban; Northchurch is not. It is a semi-rural village

that attracts an older resident due to its location, local amenities and rural feel, while providing easy access to Berkhamsted and Tring. By failing to acknowledge that Northchurch exists, the Delivery Strategy fails to assess the impact that overcrowding and increased traffic flows will have on Northchurch residents and their quality of life.

The proposed developments contradict a key aim of the Delivery Strategy: ‘to focus on ensuring that developments are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station’. (Para 23.121)

The proposed developments in Northchurch are on a steep hill and are 5 kms from the shopping centre and train station. This is too far for residents to walk which means they will take their cars. The Development Strategy recognises that ‘there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town’. The roads leading from the proposed development sites to the town centre are equally restricted and the increase in traffic would lead to congestion and health and environmental issues for residents of Northchurch. None of the proposed development in Northchurch would allow residents to walk to any amenities and therefore, the locations are neither sustainable nor environmentally friendly.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15215

**Person ID** 1264623

**Full Name** Judy Chaussalet

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Sites around Berkhamsted: Over-development (building on most of the Green Belt fields surrounding Berkhamsted) will have a significant impact on the character of the town, not to mention the environment, the wildlife and biodiversity. The proposed developments are all at a significant distance from the town centre, not to mention uphill, these are not sustainable locations and make car use more likely for short trips into the historic centre. There are no exceptional circumstances justifying removal of this Green Belt land, in fact building here goes against the essential aim of Green Belt (permanent openness) by encroaching on the small amount of green breathing space encircling the town. Berkhamsted sits in a valley and so any new development on its valley sides is very visible. The 31% increase in housing (on top of

many recent new large developments) is excessive. The River Bulbourne, an internationally important chalk stream - a fragile and valuable habitat - along with the ecosystem and wildlife dependent on it, will be adversely affected. Local infrastructure cannot support such a large increase in population, the water supply is already over-extracted, there is little public transport, the road capacity is limited by a valley location and roads are already congested and polluted from existing recent developments. Other considerations include the fact that schools and doctors' surgeries in the town are increasingly overwhelmed and that the historic and rural character of a small market town like Berkhamsted could be easily and permanently destroyed by careless over-development of this kind.

For all sites and proposals: review buildings in urban areas across Dacorum to consider those no longer in business use for conversion to residential use.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15216

**Person ID** 1271003

**Full Name** Thierry Chausalet

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

Sites around Berkhamsted: Over-development (building on most of the Green Belt fields surrounding Berkhamsted) will have a significant impact on the character of the town, not to mention the environment, the wildlife and biodiversity. The proposed developments are all at a significant distance from the town centre, not to mention uphill, these are not sustainable locations and make car use more likely for short trips into the historic centre. There are no exceptional circumstances justifying removal of this Green Belt land, in fact building here goes against the essential aim of Green Belt (permanent openness) by encroaching on the small amount of green breathing space encircling the town. Berkhamsted sits in a valley and so any new development on its valley sides is very visible. The 31% increase in housing (on top of many recent new large developments) is excessive. The River Bulbourne, an internationally important chalk stream - a fragile and valuable habitat - along with the ecosystem and wildlife dependent on it, will be adversely affected. Local infrastructure cannot support such a large increase in population, the water supply is already over-extracted, there is little public transport, the road capacity is limited by a valley location and roads are already congested and polluted from existing recent developments. Other considerations include the fact that schools and doctors' surgeries in the town are

increasingly overwhelmed and that the historic and rural character of a small market town like Berkhamsted could be easily and permanently destroyed by careless over-development of this kind.

For all sites and proposals: review buildings in urban areas across Dacorum to consider those no longer in business use for conversion to residential use.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15238
<b>Person ID</b>	1163189
<b>Full Name</b>	Shenagh Franklin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the Dacorum Local Plan on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The number of houses proposed is too great for the towns' future needs and should be based on the most recent 2018 Office for National Statistics projections which I understand are more modest. The Government is proposing to revitalise the north of England but less housing is proposed there than in the much more crowded</li> <li>2 The Green Belt land in Dacorum is very valuable to local residents for recreation, wildlife and the separation of each town. Despite this, much of the proposed housing in Dacorum is to be built on Green Belt land which, once built on, will be lost to the community at large. Consideration should be given to the value of this Green Belt land in the light of the coronavirus pandemic. It is important that the towns in Dacorum remain separate and maintain their own individual Developments such as Bulbourne Cross between Berkhamsted and Bourne End must not be allowed to encroach on the rural land which separates each town and village.</li> <li>3 Insufficient regard is given in the Local Plan to the area's infrastructure. The development proposed will place an intolerable burden on the infrastructure, particularly in regard to the volume of traffic generated in town centres, the provision of water and waste treatment. Hospital services. are also under pressure currently and increased housing will only make this worse.</li> <li>4 The proposed volume of housing will have a severe and detrimental impact on the provision of water and sewerage services which are already under strain. Water would have to be taken from the chalk aquifer and this would damage the area's valuable chalk streams which are already under threat.</li> </ol>

- 5 More regeneration of brown field sites should be considered. The coronavirus pandemic is having a great impact on business and commercial practice and should be taken into account for future plans.
- 6 Dacorum is home for thousands of people and provides a pleasant environment with its individual country towns and attractive rural setting. The town centres are the hub of each town and if too much housing on the periphery of towns is allowed the centres will be swamped with traffic. Berkhamsted, in particular, is far too hilly for residents living in the proposed developments on the upper periphery of the town to walk or cycle to and from the town centre.

Please give consideration to these points and amend the Dacorum Local Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15259

**Person ID** 1271089

**Full Name** Patrick Sullivan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development outlined in Dacorum Borough's Council document, titled, "Emerging Strategy for Growth 2021-2038".

My principle objections are;

1 Proposed housing development appears over estimated . I question the formula the Council has used to obtain these figures. For a small village like Northchurch, over 200 houses appears far too high. Let alone, the increased housing in South Berkhamsted as well.

1 Loss of Greenspaces and Green Belt Land. I have lived in my house since it was built and have enjoyed the green fields behind Chaucer Close and by Bell and Darrs Lane, including the fields by the A41. My husband and I do not drive and the ability to access greenspaces, from our house on foot, has been invaluable. It was a godsend for our

mental health during this pandemic, as unable to shop or go anywhere, our daily walk included these spaces to take in the stunning. Once these green spaces are gone - they are gone, we can never get them back for our future generations to enjoy like we have.

1 Water and Sewerage. I am very concerned about the potential for flooding with the increase in housing. Especially as I live lower down in the valley and further down from where this huge development would be built. I believe DBC is relying on outdated data which shows potential water supply and drainage issues.

1 Northchurch's Identity. I believe it is important for Northchurch to retain its identity and community rather than be renamed as "West Berkhamsted". I have lived here all my life, my daughter and my Grandsons are also residents of Northchurch and the community feel here would be lost with the proposal of all these houses and lack of amenities to go with it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15260

**Person ID** 1271090

**Full Name** FRANCES GRAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to object to the planning proposed in Northchurch. I have been a resident in Peters Place for over 30 years and do not want all that I enjoy to be spoilt. I use the Tesco Express on High Street South just off Darrs Lane) for my daily shop which could not cope with the increased volume of residents, let alone the increased number of cars trying to park and accessing the junction with A4251. I walk everywhere and that area would become a dangerous area for me to use and a far from enjoyable experience. Also any proposed housing in the Canal Fields off New Road would increase the traffic over the canal bridge (it is old and single traffic only) plus the T-junction outside St Mary's School would become an accident zone. Again this is an area that I have accessed to enjoy a walk along the Canal.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15263
<b>Person ID</b>	1271091
<b>Full Name</b>	Verlie Sullivan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development outlined in Dacorum Borough's Council document, titled, "Emerging Strategy for Growth 2021-2038".</p> <p>My principle objections are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Proposed housing development appears over estimated . I question the formula the Council has used to obtain these figures. For a small village like Northchurch, over 200 houses appears far too high. Let alone, the increased housing in South Berkhamsted as well.</li> <li>1 Loss of Greenspacees and Green Belt Land. I have lived in my house since it was built and have enjoyed the green fields behind Chaucer Close and by Bell and Darrs Lane, including the fields by the A41. My husband and I do not drive and the ability to access greenspaces, from our house on foot, has been invaluable. It was a godsend for our mental health during this pandemic, as unable to shop or go anywhere, our daily walk included these spaces to take in the stunning. Once these green spaces are gone - they are gone, we can never get them back for our future generations to enjoy like we have.</li> <li>1 Water and Sewerage. I am very concerned about the potential for flooding with the increase in housing. Especially as I live lower down in the valley and further down from where this huge development would be built. I believe DBC is relying on outdated data which shows potential water supply and drainage issues.</li> </ol>



1 Northchurch's Identity. I believe it is important for Northchurch to retain its identity and community rather than be renamed as "West Berkhamsted". I have lived here all my life, my daughter and my Grandsons are also residents of Northchurch and the community feel here would be lost with the proposal of all these houses and lack of amenities to go with it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15265

**Person ID** 405271

**Full Name** Mr Brian & Heidi Norris

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** 'We disagree with the strategic objectives and strongly disagree with proposed development on green belt land. The Dacorum Local Plan has serious implications for Berkhamsted, ie our local infrastructure (water supply, doctors surgeries), overloaded schools, traffic congestion.'

We write with 53 years experience of living in Berkhamsted - at the same address

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15322

**Person ID** 1265045

**Full Name** Joanne Loch

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to submit my objections to the proposed Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038.</p> <p>To begin with, there are several personal reasons for my objection, and then I will go into the effects on my neighbours and local community.</p> <p>I have chosen to live and bring up my young family here in Northchurch because of the proximity to rural and natural landscapes. This is essential for my mental well-being, and yet even now, it can be difficult to find enough spots for walking and exercise that are not already swarming with other people doing the same. This has changed hugely over the last ten years and especially the last few years with other big housing developments in the areas such as Bearroc Park, as well as smaller additions that seem to creep in. Before this I felt that the surrounding area to Northchurch and Berkhamsted was an area of wonderfully unspoilt countryside, but it is becoming increasingly like other over crowded towns such as St Albans (which I have lived in and had to leave) because of the high population, road noise and pollution and over-crowded streets, shops and services. This is really sad and also creates an urban existence which of course as you must already know, that is not what we live here for.</p> <p>Health issues of my own such as asthma, mean that I need to access good quality, clean air, which is already threatened on our walk to St Marys School with the pollution from clogged up traffic on the Northchurch High Street and New Road. The high volume of through traffic has already been an issue of safety at the road crossing on the Northchurch High Street, and honestly walking up the very narrow path to visit friends who live further up New Road, feels terribly dangerous, most especially for those of us with younger children. As you know, we suffered the death of a young girl in recent years who was crossing the road at the high street. With a huge increase in traffic, it would be necessary to have many more points of traffic lights for pedestrian safety. Of course, this then causes a back log of traffic congestion, adding to pollution and so on.</p> <p>This is all without the addition of your proposed housing developments. And the disruption of the work being carried out. The thought of large vehicles passing while walking with children up New Road is frightening. I have even been knocked by a passing van on occasion when walking my children to school. More should be done about the clogged up roads and there should be council work done to improve the safety around the school and church areas, yet instead these plans are only going to serve in making the situation far worse.</p>

Having always appreciated our beautiful countryside, I have always been so thankful for the GreenBelt protection, and always felt that we were lucky to have this and not suffer the effects of losing all of the natural and rural areas as we have sadly seen in other areas. I am absolutely shocked and appalled that this can apparently be over-ridden? This cannot be right? Who on earth would think that this is a good idea? When the planet is already struggling, losing native species of wildlife, devastating our beautiful protected green belt should be the last thing that any council suggests. There is so much information on climate change out there, I presumed that our local authorities would be doing everything that they can to keep us, and all the local wildlife, healthy and happy within our greenbelt protection.

If the Pandemic has taught us anything, surely the need and right for every human to have access to exercise in nature has been high on all of our lists.

Northchurch itself is a historical village, with community around the school and churches, and yet it is already being stretched outwards by housing developments. If we do this to our villages we will be just one mass

of housing estates with the odd green patch here and there, with no natural barrier to protect the character and beauty of the area.

Neighbours on our road have lived here for decades and we love it as a village in its own right. Our personal choice was to move here from central Berkhamsted, to escape some of the hustle and bustle, overcrowding, traffic issues and to be closer to the rural end of the area. It seems that Northchurch is being seen as an extension of Berkhamsted, and simply an easy route to add on a huge amount of housing at no doubt premium prices, with absolutely no regard to the current residents and their well-being. The increases that this would cause in traffic, pollution, population, waiting lists and general queuing everywhere is horrendous, without the loss of our beautiful surroundings as well. What would make anyone want to do this?

Many of the people living in my area of Northchurch are elderly, and being able to take local walks, visit supermarkets and amenities are all important yet have you ensured that they have their say in this? There would be years of disruption in the surrounding area, more traffic and pollution, yet I feel this age group have been somewhat forgotten in your pledge to build more houses. It is not only for young families to be considered in villages and town planning. Northchurch has always been a quiet and peaceful place to live, and perfect for retirement. The already increased volume of traffic and busyness in local shops is already threatening this.

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS15333
<b>Person ID</b>	1271134
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs John & Vanessa Hodder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My wife and I are residents of Northchurch, a parish situated on the A4251 almost halfway between Berkhamsted and Tring. A4251 is a single road connecting Berkhamsted and Tring. It cannot cope with any further drastic increase in traffic.</p> <p>We note with dismay the proposals in the Dacorum Local Plan, 2020 to 2038 "Shaping Growth in Dacorum", page 15 "Key Developments in Berkhamsted" show proposed new housing and a "potential" new school situated directly south west of Northchurch and ending at the A41 as well as encroaching on Green Belt land in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The increase in school traffic alone, added to existing commuter traffic, is enough to heighten the potential for delay or accident using the narrow lanes in rush hour.</p> <p>In addition, the increased load on the local infrastructure will put stress on existing services such as schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals and parking. Proposals such as these will change the character of hitherto traditional market towns permanently.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15337
<b>Person ID</b>	1271161
<b>Full Name</b>	Philippa Seldon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In addition it is obvious that in Berkhamsted important services, such as water supply, drainage etc would not be adequate for the proposed number of houses. Also, although promises are made, would more schools and GP's etc. really be put in place? What about hospital beds?!
	I urge you to support Councillor Pringle's motion.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15368
<b>Person ID</b>	1271231
<b>Full Name</b>	A J LLOYD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Having seen your proposals for new building in this village I consider that to build 200 houses plus a new school on the Darrs Lane/ Bell Lane area is grossly excessive. The roads between Shootersway and the High Street are totally inadequate for the traffic that would be generated and any widening of these lanes would destroy ancient hedges which are an essential part of the Green Belt in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
	Dacorum should reject the proposed amount of new building. Furthermore, Northchurch is a separate very old village and must not be, and does not wish to be, treated as part of Berkhamsted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS15374
<b>Person ID</b>	1271232
<b>Full Name</b>	MR & MRS P J TAYLOR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>2}"Too many'houses are proposed for Dacorum in general and Berkhamsted and Northchurch in particular. We understand that the numbers proposed are based on a calculation that is outdated and wrong and that calculations carried out by other experts indicate that this should be much lower. About a third of the current proposal. We also understand that this figure should be a starting point and should take into account local circumstances and restrictions including our greenbelt and the surrounding AONB which should further reduce the allocation.</p> <p>This means the whole basis of the plan and the consultation unsound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of Greenbelt -, ' .</li> </ul> <p>The countryside is very important to us and the character of Shootersway with its ancient ditches, hedgerows and woodland are important, not just to us having lived here for almost 60 years, but also for the wildlife that lives in them, the hedges and trees forming an important corridor linking up many areas of copse and woodland including Hockeridge and the woodlands of Rossway and Champneys. We would be devastated if these important landmarks were lost to make way for housing which will not benefit the existing community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Roads. The proposals would mean more than 2000 extra households on this side of the valley. This will mean a lot more traffic, Cross Oak Road already suffers from too much traffic you often have to wait a long time above the pinch point above Greenway before you can come down the The junction of Cross Oak with Anglefield is becoming more dangerous as many people don't expect to have to slow or stop here, finally the lower part of Cross Oak Road is already congested as the parked cars make it single track. Cross Oak Road cannot take additional traffic, this was realised when the pinch point was put in.</li> </ul> <p>Berkhamsted was given a bypass as the High Street traffic was too congested, but traffic levels are almost back to where they were and there are frequently long queues for the traffic lights in the centre. Additional housing will only make this worse. We know that Tring residents also frequently shop in Berkhamsted so the proposals in Tring will also adversely affect us.</p> <p>The extra traffic noise and pollution will also directly affect us and other residents in the town.</p>

- The extra traffic will generate extra pollution, air pollution monitoring has shown that the fumes accumulate in the valley meaning that an increase in the number of cars in Berkhamsted and Tring will affect our air quality especially in the valley bottom. Five of our schools two of our doctor's surgeries, our dentists and our High street shops will have worse air quality.

Even if combustion engines are replaced by electric cars, they will still generate dust from tyres and brakes.

- Water, most of our water comes from the chalk beneath us, but this is a limited The River Bulbourne used to start in Bulbourne but now starts near the Cow Roast because of abstraction. In dry years our Chalk river dries up and does not flow, the more water that is abstracted the more frequently this happens, yet globally Chalk streams are very rare and should be protected, not just from too much water being taken out but also from the surface runoff and pollution of urban areas.

The water needed by the extra housing will further damage the river and the habitats it supports.

#### Included files

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15418

**Person ID** 1271261

**Full Name** Gavin and Victoria Rees

#### Organisation Details

#### Agent ID

#### Agent Full Name

#### Agent Organisation

#### Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

#### Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment

This letter puts forward my opposition and concerns on the current 'Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020 - 2038'. My objections are based upon the following issues:

#### 1. The Number of Proposed houses.

The number of proposed houses within the development plan were developed by an algorithm rather than actual requirements. The latest projections from the Office of National Statistics says that 355 dwellings per year for Dacorum are required, but the development plan is putting forward for 922 developments or possibly over 1000 developments per year depending on the algorithm of choice at the time. The National Planning Policy Framework expects local authorities to use the latest available information and therefore this should result in a housing need calculation that is less than half of that currently proposed in the plan.

It is clear that the proposed number of houses is just not required or suitable for Dacorum area. The plan is also flawed as it will not be dealing with a case of supply and demand, as it will not be addressing affordable housing need, it will merely relocate people from London and other affluent areas.

## 2. Greenbelt Issues and Merging of towns:

If this plan were to go ahead, it will mean thousands of houses being built on greenbelt land, including over 400 houses in Northchurch.

The CPRE states that "One third of the countryside area in Dacorum Borough is within the Chilterns AONB and that this is a designated protected landscape of national importance, which the Borough Council has a legal duty to protect and enhance. As well as ensuring the protection of the AONB area itself, the Borough Council must also ensure the protection of the setting of the AONB. This is the land outside the boundaries of the AONB where inappropriate development could impact on the special qualities of the AONB, due to its visual intrusion but also due to noise, vehicle traffic and pollution."

The CPRE findings are also backed up by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in sections 13 and 15 as per the details below:

1 Development goes against Section 13, relating to Green Belt By definition (point 134)

"The Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a. *to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- b. *to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- c. *to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- d. *to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- e. *to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land."*

The proposed development will mean the sprawl of large built up areas, the merging of Berkhamsted into Northchurch into Tring, it would encroach the on countryside and does not encourage the use of derelict and other urban land as part of the proposal. The proposal does not even recognise Northchurch as a separate entity and is referred to in the plans as West Berkhamsted, clearly a sign of what the future will hold if these plans go ahead.

The NPPF says (in point 143) "Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances." It then goes on to say in point 144 to say, "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." And that, as per point 145 "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt."

Section 15, point 170, which deals with Conserving and enhancing the natural environment states that: "*Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes



*b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans;"

The development in question does not take any of these items into consideration and will destroy 850 hectares of Hertfordshire Green Belt land, countryside and urban green spaces.

Due to the massive effect that the coronavirus pandemic has had on businesses, it is very likely that there will be an increased amount of commercial land available in the future years, which could be used for residential use and the plan fails to identify these properly. Therefore, some of the proposed green belt sites are unlikely to be required based on this and therefore the plans need to be amended to take this into account.

### 3. Infrastructure and Road Safety

The development will put a severe strain on a large number of services and does little to identify the improvements required to support the increase in housing. There is already a strain on healthcare services, education facilities and amenities.

Water supplies in the Dacorum area are already under stress, especially during dry summer months according to the CPRE. Present plans do not cover in enough detail new sources of water supply and how it will protect the three designated chalk streams in the borough (the Gade, Bulbourne and Ver). The proposed increase in housing will require substantial investment in infrastructure in order to transport and treat wastewater and sewage. The proposed plan makes no mention of how improvements in wastewater and sewerage infrastructure will be funded and the time period for their completion.

The proposed development sites are located in areas of Berkhamsted where, because of the steep relief lines and landscape of our valley town and, limited of public transport, residents use the car rather than walk or cycle. The sites put forward in Berkhamsted and Northchurch would only increase car usage and exacerbate already existing problems of congestion and pollution associated to traffic and the council have not put forward an appropriate spend on improving road capacity. I have hugely worrying concerns over the safety for both my children and the routes that they walk to school. The roads are already busy and dangerous have resulted in numerous accidents over the years and there is large support for the local 'Go 20' group before this development has even begun.

### 4. Environmental Factors:

The density of these homes will also have a huge impact on the wildlife and rare species are likely to totally disappear along with the disappearance of our green areas. The Lockfield Site will mean the loss of a wildlife area which currently acts as a safe transition zone for animals trying to get up to the Ashridge Estate and the loss of the other greenfields put forward for development will mean further loss of the countryside and its landscape. Developments will be built on ancient woodlands and the aesthetics of the whole area will be detrimentally changed.

In addition to these, when the A41 was initially built, a 'Green Lung' was created around it so that people weren't living on top of it, but this plan goes totally against that concept.

To sum up, from my perspective, the whole project will change the nature, landscape and character of the whole district. The reason that we made the decision to move to the area some 14 years ago and have a family in this area was due to its accessibility and location within the countryside. This plan will have a significant negative impact on all residents and will result in the decimation of our countryside. It will in addition have a huge negative on the mental and physical well-being of all residents and wildlife, all for a project, that is not required on a scale of this size and does not have the support of not only the residents but goes against the government's own policies and the advice of so many national bodies.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15450

**Person ID** 350823

**Full Name** Mrs Sue Yeomans

**Organisation Details** Chairman  
Chilterns Countryside Group

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

2.i. The LP fails to take into account the cumulative effects of development upon air quality, which is likely to be adversely impacted by the proposed expansions of Heathrow & London Luton airports, both of which operate over the airspace of the Borough. The health of the substantial increase in an urban population, which the LP proposes, is more likely to be adversely affected, we would suggest, by proximity to flight paths which overfly 24 hours a day and by the destruction of green, open spaces and wooded areas which, otherwise, might afford some mitigation.

2.ii. The LP states: *'the potential to result in adverse effects on the local and wider landscapes, such as the setting of the Chilterns AONB'*. (4.4.9) Further, *'....concentrating the majority of development in the Borough's most sustainable settlements .... would help to reduce the amount of greenfield land required to deliver the levels of growth in the Local Plan, thereby reducing levels of adverse effects on local landscapes'*.

Further: 'Policies in the plan directly seek to protect the local landscape and townscape through protecting the natural environment and ensuring high quality design of new development.'

The CCG strongly disagrees with these assertions as 'the level of adverse effects on local landscapes' at Tring and Berkhamsted are so severe that it is incomprehensible to view these proposals as a reduction in adverse impact. We strongly disagree that the LP policies 'protect' the Borough's natural environment. Indeed, it is the view of the CCG, that they seek to **deliberately destroy** much of the best quality landscapes.

Development of top quality agricultural fields and other Green Belt sites, abutting and visible from the Chilterns AONB with 'neighbourhoods' of between 2,200 and 1,870 homes, respectively, plus associated infrastructure of primary & secondary schools, roads, commercial properties together with lighting and other services, can hardly be called, by any measure, as reducing impact and protecting the natural landscape.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15484

**Person ID** 1271381

**Full Name** Alison Walker

**Organisation Details** Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects  
Thakeham Homes

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

- The Emerging Strategy for Growth proposes to allocate thirteen sites for residential development at Berkhamsted, which in total would deliver 1,876 homes in and around the town. Policy SP20 sets out that there are 143 known commitments in Berkhamsted and the remaining growth of 217 dwellings is expected to be met via windfall sites over the plan

- Policy SP20 sets out what uses each of the sites is principally allocated for. Of the major urban extension sites, other than dwellings and associated public open space, the only other allocations proposed to deliver any other uses are as follows:

*Bk01 – South of Berkhamsted – Community hub and primary school; and Bk06 – East of Darrs Lane – Land for a new secondary school.*

- Given the scale of growth proposed at Berkhamsted and the Council’s clear vision for both the settlement and the Borough to ensure the necessary supporting infrastructure is delivered alongside housing, it is questioned whether the limited supporting infrastructure proposed as part of the allocations is sufficient. Indeed, it is notable that Policy SP20 only identifies sites to deliver a primary school and land for a new secondary school whilst the supporting text identifies the need for two primary schools as well as a secondary school. Concern is raised that as a result of the piecemeal nature of the sites identified to deliver growth at Berkhamsted, this limits the ability to plan for wider needs in a coordinated and strategic manner. Our client’s site at Bulbourne Cross could be delivered in a comprehensive manner with significant supporting infrastructure which would benefit from its close relationship to the proposed Bk01 allocation with the infrastructure it is proposed to deliver as well as providing itself on Bulbourne Cross, some of the infrastructure necessary for the continued and coordinated growth of
- The supporting text to the Policy also highlights the congestion challenges that the town experiences. Whilst the text states that there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town, this highlights that the Council has failed to fully assess the potential of our client’s site at Bulbourne

1.5 Bulbourne Cross would benefit from a direct access on to the A41 and with the potential for interconnectivity with site Bk01 has the potential to draw traffic away from the congested town centre. With the services and facilities which would be on offer within the site itself and the potential for a more comprehensive approach to be taken to public transport and pedestrian/cycle connection improvements alongside Bk01, this has the potential to provide further enhancement to address the current issues experienced by the town both in terms of traffic and air quality.

- Our comments regarding the separate sites which form part of the wider South Berkhamsted area are provided at Section 4 and as such are not repeated
- The South Berkhamsted growth area includes eight site allocations, which are not all This largest site, Bk01 – Land south Berkhamsted is anticipated to deliver around 850 dwellings, a new community hub, a primary school and public open space, and is the only site within the SP21 growth area to deliver significant community benefits.

- There is a cluster of four sites at the western side of the growth area which comprise Bk02 – British Film Institute, Bk03 - Haslam Playing Field, Bk04 Land between Hanburys and A41, and Bk10 Hanbury's which in total will provide 350 dwellings. In addition, Bk09 – Bank Mill Lane is intended to deliver 50 dwellings to the south of the River Bulbourne, and adjacent to part of our client's site, Land east of Berkhamsted, which has not been proposed for allocation. Aside from individual sites providing their own public open space, no meaningful community facilities will be provided at any of these smaller sites Bk02, Bk03, Bk04, Bk09 and Bk10 within the SP21 growth
- The typo in the first line of the policy where there is confusion between the singular "*a comprehensively planned*" and plural "*urban extensions*" highlights that even the Council is unclear whether this policy is seeking to achieve a single comprehensive masterplan for South Berkhamsted or a series of separate urban extensions. Similar confusion is also noted at paragraph 23.129. The physically separate nature and disjointed land ownerships of the proposed allocations will not allow for a comprehensive growth area at South
- Only the largest site, Bk01 is providing any other facilities. As outlined above, none of the other allocations are in proximity of this site. Therefore, claiming that these sites contribute to or are connected to the South Berkhamsted growth area is disingenuous seeing as they will not benefit from access to any services or facilities provided by the larger site Bk01. This lack of co-ordination in terms of infrastructure delivery clearly indicates that the vision for delivering comprehensive growth in South Berkhamsted will not be achieved and is contrary to the Council's overarching vision for new
- The Policy commits the Council to preparing a Masterplan to include Development Parcel Design Codes to seek to draw together the disparate allocations into a comprehensive proposal. Whilst we raise no objection to the principle of such an approach, concern is raised regarding the potential delays this could cause to the delivery of development given the requirement for the SPD to be prepared in collaboration with the various landowners involved. This additional, potentially lengthy process is a direct result of the approach taken to the allocation of sites and would not be experienced by our client's site which is under the control of a single
- Our comments in relation to Policy SP21 equally apply to Policy SP22 and as such we do not repeat these
- Policy SP22 Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted aims to bring forward "a series of comprehensively planned urban extensions to Berkhamsted in accordance with a Masterplan led approach and based on the TCPA Garden City "

- The West Berkhamsted growth area includes three site allocations, which would deliver a total of 480 Aside from individual sites providing their own public open space, the only other land use being planned for is land for a new secondary school on Bk06 – Land east of Darrs Lane. It should be noted that the policy does not actually require provision of the school as part of the development leading to uncertainty over its delivery.
- The three sites’ distances from the town centre, their poor access to public transport and the intervening gradient have been recognised in the site assessment for Sustainability Appraisal as a potential barrier to achieving sustainable modes of travel. None of the three sites are of a sufficient size to provide on-site services and facilities, and they are unlikely to support significantly enhanced public transport.
- The sites in the West Berkhamsted growth area (as well as Bk03 - Haslam Playing Fields Bk10 - Hanburys) all require access to be provided to Shootersway. In addition, the four western sites of the South Berkhamsted growth area are required to contribute to enhancements to Shootersway. This will add significant extra traffic to Shootersway, resulting in delays and congestion, as identified in the Dacorum Local Plan Strategic Transport Modelling Report produced by Aecom (May 2020).
- The supporting text to the policy identifies the key issues/development requirements to be delivered and or addressed in West Berkhamsted including “*primary schools.*” As discussed in relation to Policy SP20, only one site for a primary school is proposed for allocation through the Local Plan despite the identification of a need for two primary schools even based on current proposed growth levels. There is a clear inconsistency within the Plan as to how and if education needs are being met which must be addressed to ensure the needs of the proposed developments are met

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15551
<b>Person ID</b>	399231
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Carol Webb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Strategic Planning for 2236 houses in Berko. I strongly disagree
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15554
<b>Person ID</b>	1271488
<b>Full Name</b>	Moira Thomson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have lived in Berkhamsted for over fifty years &amp; one of the reasons I have continued to live here is the easy access to lovely countryside, this past year has shown us how important the countryside is to our health &amp; welfare.</p> <p>I am appalled at the extent of the development planned for Berkhamsted &amp; Northchurch &amp; the amount of Green Belt included in this.</p> <p>I know there is a need particularly for affordable homes but I understand there is plenty of scope for this on brownfield sites. There is also the possibility of the conversion of commercial space to residential use. These people are likely to need easy access for public transport.</p> <p>I should also like to make the point that the infrastructure is already under great pressure in this area.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15647
<b>Person ID</b>	1271974
<b>Full Name</b>	EMILY FORD

<b>Organisation Details</b>	SENIOR PLANNER
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As set out above in Section 4 of these representations, we support the identification of proposed site allocations to the west of Berkhamsted, including Croudace's land at Rossway As noted in paragraph 23.108 of the Plan, 'this broad location of growth will minimise the impact on the sensitive landscape surrounding the settlement, provide for a more balanced east-west growth to the town, and limit impact on the better performing Green Belt areas'. We agree with this statement and consider that it forms part of the exceptional circumstances justifying the release of land to the west of Berkhamsted from the Green Belt.</li> <li>In this context, the key objectives for growth at Berkhamsted set out in paragraph 112 are broadly supported by Croudace.</li> <li>The allocation of Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (Land between Shootersway and A41) for around 200 dwellings with public open space, as noted in Table 35, is also</li> <li>We understand that DBC are seeking to coordinate the development of the multiple mixed use site allocations in Berkhamsted through an overall masterplanning approach as noted in paragraph 113 of the draft Plan. We recognise that there will be a need to coordinate the delivery of infrastructure, particularly where this is required as a result of cumulative development within an identified Growth Area. As such, the objective behind this approach is supported in principle.</li> <li>However, we consider that the preparation of an SPD has the potential to unduly delay the delivery of development within the West Berkhamsted Growth To this end, we recommend that, in place of an SPD, masterplanning is undertaken collaboratively as part of a development brief or concept framework masterplan prepared by site promoters working in collaboration with DBC and in consultation with the local community. Such an approach would set out high level design principles to ensure comprehensive delivery whilst also retaining flexibility so that</li> </ul>



development proposals, informed by and in the context of the agreed framework masterplan, can be brought forward by individual developers, taking account of detailed technical work undertaken at the planning application stage.

- It will be important that any masterplanning work is informed by key considerations such as ongoing work with HCC regarding school provision and the impact assessment on the Paragraph 23.126 of the Plan identifies that an area of search within the west Berkhamsted growth location is being explored to examine the feasibility of accommodating a primary and secondary school. We recognise that Local Plan growth in Berkhamsted will generate demand for additional school places and Croudace are committed to working collaboratively with HCC and DBC alongside the other promoters of land within the West Berkhamsted Growth Area to address educational need to establish a deliverable solution.
- Moreover, and related to this point, we note the Local Plan as currently drafted has some inconsistency about the quantum of location of where new schools are to be provided within Paragraph 23.125 of the draft Plan suggests, a need within Berkhamsted for a 6FE Secondary and two new 2FE primary schools. However, it is noted the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2020) identifies a need for two new primary schools (a 2FE and 3FE) but also an 8FE Secondary School. We recognise work is ongoing with HCC concerning the education infrastructure required to support the delivery of the proposed housing growth in Berkhamsted and would request that clarity is provided on the requirements in consultation with the developers/land controlling parties supporting the promotion of the draft allocations.
- In terms of delivery of the education requirements, a new primary school is identified within Growth Area BK01 (South Berkhamsted) and a secondary school within growth area BK06 (East of Darrs Lane). We understand work is ongoing regarding a preferred location for the second primary school which is not carried through into Policy SP20 or, indeed, the individual draft growth area
- We recommend that confirmation of the anticipated demand for school places is sought as a priority so that work can progress on identifying the most appropriate locations for any necessary school facilities. This work should have regard to how need could best be accommodated, as well as appropriate locations for school provision taking account of accessibility and
- We support the proposed strategy for delivering growth in West Development in this location offers a good opportunity for an urban extension which is well-related to the centre of Berkhamsted, providing new and existing residents with easy

access to existing facilities and public transport services as well as those to be provided or enhanced as part of development.

- We support the reference to a series of comprehensively planned urban extensions in Policy SP22. As worded, this infers that sites can be progressed independently subject to accordance with an overarching This approach is welcomed in principle and it is considered that it will enable development to be brought forward without the delays that could be incurred if all proposals were required to be brought forward at the same time, thereby enabling sites to contribute positively and flexibly to housing supply in the Borough.
- We note that a Masterplan and SPD is proposed to be prepared by DBC to guide and co- ordinate development on the draft growth areas within West Whilst we support the principle of seeking to align development proposals to ensure access to amenities, facilities and recreational opportunities is comprehensively considered and provided, as set out in the previous sections, we suggest that this could more effectively be achieved through other mechanisms. For example, a development brief or concept framework masterplan led by site developers, working alongside officers, provides an opportunity to frontload work to support flexible and timely delivery. As we comment in paragraph 6.4 above, this would set out high level design principles to ensure comprehensive delivery of the planned Growth Areas within West Berkshamsted whilst also retaining flexibility so that development proposals, informed by the agreed masterplan and detailed technical work undertaken at the planning application stage, can be brought forward by individual developers. The development brief/concept framework masterplan could be prepared in tandem with the preparation and consultation of the Local Plan and referred to within Policy SP22 to provide transparency about the masterplanning of the Growth Area.
- Crucially, whatever mechanism is used to align development proposals, unduly prescriptive requirements should be This is to ensure that development proposals can flexibly take account of relevant technical work undertaken at the detailed planning application stage.
- We note that the Masterplan approach set out in Policy SP22 is proposed to be based on the Town and Country Planning Association Garden City We broadly support this approach, noting that generally the principles provide for good overarching design and place-making aspirations consistent with wider development management policies, for example mixed tenure homes and housing types and sizes; development that conserves and positively enhances the natural environment, habitats and biodiversity;

extend, enhance and reinforce strategic green infrastructure and public open space; and integrated and accessible transport systems. However, given that the allocations within the West Berkhamsted Growth Area are not designated

as garden villages we recommend that there is flexibility in the application of the Garden City Principles. In particular, there should be flexibility regarding land value capture and stewardship which may not be applicable to small/medium scale urban extensions.

- In relation to part 7 of Policy SP22 (infrastructure delivery), given that there are multiple landowners within the West Berkhamsted Growth Area, an approach which allows for developments to come forward independently whilst also securing the proportionate funding and delivery of necessary infrastructure will be essential if development is to be delivered in a timely The preparation of a Development Brief/Concept Framework Masterplan would assist with this by identifying overarching principles and strategic infrastructure requirements to guide the comprehensive development of the Growth Area.
- We understand that infrastructure provision is likely to include new school facilities, the locations of which are still subject to consideration between DBC and Whilst it is recognised land within BK01 has been identified for the provision of a new secondary school we welcome the ongoing work to assess and appraise potential locations and request this is prioritised in the continuing preparation of the Local Plan. To assist this, we would welcome the opportunity to, in collaboration with all developers in the West Berkhamsted Growth Area and working with HCC and DBC, explore opportunities for delivery of education facilities.
- We would also welcome the opportunity to assist DBC in exploring appropriate mitigation for any recreational impacts on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC resulting from development in the West Berkhamsted Growth Area and identifying opportunities for improvements to the highway The outcome of any further technical assessment work could then be fed into a Development Brief/Concept Framework Masterplan to guide the delivery of sustainable development within the Growth Area.
- In respect of draft Policy SP22, the representations recommend four key points:
  - The promoters of land within the West Berkhamsted Growth Area should prepare the Concept Masterplan in collaboration with DBC and the local community and in parallel to Regulation 19 Consultation (subject to Officer's views) to expedite this process and reduce delay in delivery on adoption of the Local Plan;
  - The replacement of the SPD requirement with a Concept Framework Vision Document or Development Brief to demonstrate the Growth Area is robust and deliverable;
  - Remove the need for SANG in the absence of published evidence supported by Natural England on recreational impacts on the SAC. If deviation from the current Core Strategy position arises as a result, mitigation should be addressed at a strategic level through off-site contributions and high quality public open space on site in order to encourage walkers to remain within the West Berkhamsted Growth Area rather than drive to SAC areas; and

- A commitment to working with DBC, HCC and the other promoters to address educational needs to establish a deliverable solution.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15759

**Person ID** 1271978

**Full Name** JOANNA HARLEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment**

The context is set out in the following text from p224 of the Draft Plan:

***“Berkhamsted Homes***

***23.104*** – At least 2,200 homes will be provided in Berkhamsted over the period 2020-2038.

***23.105*** – Not all of the housing required can be achieved within the town boundary as opportunities are limited, especially given its historic and densely built-up core and high townscape quality neighbourhoods. Some 400 homes will come forward in the settlement area through identified and windfall sites.

***23.106*** – A significant amount of future housing (around 1,870 homes) will be brought forward as urban extensions through the following strategic Growth Areas:

- Land south of Berkhamsted (850 homes)
- Haslam Fields, Shootersway (150 homes)
- British Film Institute site, Kingshill Way (90 homes)
- Land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens (80 homes)
- Rossway Farm (between Shootersway and A41) (200 homes)
- Land east of Darrs Lane (200 homes)
- Lock Field, New Road, Northchurch (60 homes)
- Land between Bank Mill Lane and London Road (50 homes)
- Land at and to the rear of Hanburys, Shootersway (70 homes)

**23.107** – Further residential allocations are proposed within the urban area as follows:

- Former Durrants Furniture, Billet Lane (Jewson Site)
- Berkhamsted Civic Centre and land to the rear of High Street
- Land c/o Durrants Lane / Shootersway

**23.108** – The bulk of development will chiefly be delivered as a new planned neighbourhood to the south and west of Berkhamsted. This broad location of growth will minimise the impact on the sensitive landscape surrounding the settlement, provide for a more balanced east-west growth to the town, and limit impact on the better performing Green Belt areas. The new neighbourhood will need to be sensitively designed given its proximity to the Chilterns AONB, including the retention and enhancement of landscaping and the careful siting and design of development given the neighbourhood's mainly valley-side/ridge line location."

In our comments to Q1, we have stated a number of issues that lead us to the position Berkhamsted Town Council has adopted for this Draft Plan viz:

As recognised in Para 23.119 [Page 225] the Town experiences a high level of congestion:

**23.119** – As a settlement area, the County Council consider that Berkhamsted already has a sustainable transport network in place. There is an excellent mainline railway service to London and the town form part of a key inter-urban Aylesbury-Hemel-Watford bus route. However, they identify congestion as a key challenge in Berkhamsted resulting in constrained roads, difficulties with bus movements, and limited cycling infrastructure."

The following paragraph says: "there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town". As a town set in a valley with only one main crossing the county's engineers comment the traffic lights already operate at over capacity, with residents choosing to avoid the main roads in the town centre or travelling to shop elsewhere. Alternative routes are unlikely to be capable of being widened without very costly investment.

The Draft Plan continues:

**23.121** – Given their 'edge of town' locations, the strategic Growth Areas will need to focus on ensuring they are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station, and public and sustainable transport options are enhanced. All Growth Areas will be required to provide for on and off-site measures to alleviate local highway problems."

The last sentence is an aspiration without a foundation to support it: the Plan offers no substantive detail that necessary strategic infrastructure or sustainable transport options, to provide access to the town centre and station, from the proposed development sites, other than by car, have been planned for.

The referenced 'Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy' [Para 23.122] is nothing of the sort, mapping as it does junction enhancements at relatively minor side roads and crossings within the urban area and new/ widened footpaths along Shootersway.

We also note the paragraph that refers to the town being served by a "key inter- urban Aylesbury – Hemel – Watford bus route". Whilst the presence of said bus route – route 500 operated as a commercial service by Arriva - is correct, it operates at a frequency of 3 buses per hour on Monday-Friday, 2 buses per hour on Saturdays and 1 bus per hour on Sunday shopping hours. There is no evening service or early service on Saturdays. Due to its length, it also suffers from

reliability issues. Despite fulfilling the criteria of a “good public transport service” in the Topic papers, there is the paucity of services in other directions from Berkhamsted. We do not agree that a sustainable transport network is in place in Berkhamsted.

We note [p228]

***“Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted***

**23.129** – *The expansion of Berkhamsted to the South represents the single largest allocation in the town. When built out it will consist of a vibrant new neighbourhood of around 1,000 homes spread across several sites. It is the fact that growth will come forward on several sites which requires a cohesive approach which binds these elements together.*

**23.130** – *The development will deliver socially inclusive communities, particularly genuinely affordable homes, sustainable energy infrastructure to address climate change (contributing to our response to the Climate Emergency and need for decarbonisation), create walkable neighbourhoods and enhanced cycling provision. There is a need to bring forward a Masterplan for the area which delivers the following:”*

The Policy SP21 [p229] states:

*“The Council will bring forward a comprehensively planned urban extension to Berkhamsted in accordance with a Masterplan led approach and based on the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) Garden City Principles. The Masterplan will be prepared by the Council and adopted as an SPD working in collaboration with key partners and landowners and be subject to community and stakeholder involvement.*

*The Masterplan will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes which will inform planning applications.”*

Given recent experiences of applications that bear no resemblance to Master Plans [*although adopted as SPD*] residents will remain wary of such assurances. The Introduction to the topic [Chapter 23, p 189] asserts:

**“23.5** – *We will use Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and other documented agreements as required and undertake robust viability testing to ensure the sites (with the required infrastructure) remain deliverable. If commitments on infrastructure are not forthcoming then we reserve the right to reconsider the spatial strategy for growth, and preferred development sites, before publishing the final Plan under Regulation 19.”*

If this Draft Plan proceeds as set out, Berkhamsted residents will want to be assured that details for the key infrastructure needs to integrate the edge of town sites will be published prior to consultation on the Regulation 19 final plan.

The Appendix attached comments on the critical importance of planning road and transport links at the outset so that residents have easy access to convenient options other than using their car.

**“23.134** – *Key issues/development requirements to be delivered and or addressed in West Berkhamsted:*

- *Around 500 homes;*
- *Primary schools;*
- *A new secondary school;*
- *A district heating network; and*
- *Network of green spaces, including the delivery of Sustainable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SAND) if required.”*

While residents are concerned about the shortage of school places at secondary level in particular, the sustainability and viability of the secondary school will be under great pressure for many years until pupil numbers attract the funding to sustain the level of staffing provision necessary to support the school. This has not been addressed in the Draft Plan or IDP.

It is manifest that transport movements will add to congestion on Shootersway while Darrs Lane, a narrow country lane, will require major investment to support the additional traffic. Increased traffic on Darrs Lane will also intensify congestion in Northchurch village centre.

**Included files** [STAT - Berkhamsted Town Council - Draft Local Plan\\_BTC response\\_vfinalB.pdf](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15763

**Person ID** 1271978

**Full Name** JOANNA HARLEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment** In general, the justification for including most of the Berkhamsted sites are a result of planners accepting a Government target and claiming this as exceptional circumstances despite Government commitment to protecting the Green Belt. Most of these proposed allocations should be rejected. The weakness of infrastructure plans are highlighted elsewhere but for instance exactly how and by whom are the networks of new pedestrian links with adjacent allocations to be provided?

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15777

**Person ID** 1271978

**Full Name** JOANNA HARLEY

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Berkhamsted</b></p> <p>Berkhamsted is a beautiful town, ideal commuting distance from London. But it has the challenge of its location. It is set in a relatively steep valley which rises over 60m from the bottom of the valley to the top. The main road up the valley, forms the high street through the town. The Railway station is near the centre of the town. There are not many alternative roads to the high street, to get from one end of the town to the other. There are few radial roads. So for most journeys from the periphery of the town, to any other part of town it is necessary to go through the centre. The result is the main junction in the town is regularly grid locked in rush hour.</p> <p>The centre of the town was built in the 19th century. With narrow streets and no off-street parking. In the 20th Century the town continued to expand until the periphery is no longer in walking distance of the centre.</p> <p>There are no natural routes for new roads to relieve this. The existing roads are not capable of handling the existing traffic.</p> <p><b>Future development</b></p> <p>There are proposals to build 2,200 new houses on the edge of town. Most of these will be large family houses which will not be affordable on local wages.</p> <p>No explanation has been provided as to how the town's road and transport system will be able to cope with the resultant journeys that will be</p> <p><b>Future development</b></p> <p>There are proposals to build 2,200 new houses on the edge of town. Most of these will be large family houses which will not be affordable on local wages.</p> <p>No explanation has been provided as to how the town's road and transport system will be able to cope with the resultant journeys that will be generated.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	



# 23 Tring Delivery Strategy responses

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS62
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS118
<b>Person ID</b>	1256432
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Schafer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Tring delivery strategy will destroy the character of Tring as a small market town with a strong sense of community. The East Tring developments and proposed new road will create a large domitary suburb too far away from the existing town centre to form part of the same community. Tring does not provide enough employment to mean that these developments would have 'excellent access to [local] jobs. They will be isolated suburban developments dumped in an area currently rich with nature.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS185
<b>Person ID</b>	1254351
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Hodgson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am commenting on the Tring Delivery Strategy. Paragraphs 23.144 to and including 23.147</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You are contemplating more or less doubling the size of Tring, currently a small market town. This will destroy the nature of the town and turn it into a commuter area.</li> <li>2. You say that you will encourage walking and cycling. It is clear that very few people will walk or cycle to the town centre as these new developments are more than a mile away. The town already suffers from frequent traffic jams and poor parking provision. The virtual doubling of the town will double the traffic.</li> <li>3. You are considering building on green belt. The Government is already reconsidering it's strategy for building numbers required in the south. You do not seem to have taken this into consideration.</li> <li>4. Your commitment to wildlife and the environment sounds like wishful thinking.</li> </ol> <p>The Government is reviewing it's strategy and requirements for building in the south. I request that you do not adopt a local plan until it is clearer what criteria you are expected to meet.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS230
<b>Person ID</b>	490644
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Helena Holliday
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Tring Movement - Railway Station</b></p> <p>The plan needs to include greatly increased <b>railway station parking</b>, hinted at in Key Issue 20.6. Pre-Covid-19, the parking was full by 8am on weekdays. Some commuters drove to Berkhamsted to catch the train instead. However, Berkhamsted station will get busier with its planned 2,200 houses. It is unrealistic to wish for many of the residents of the new housing to walk or cycle, other than a few of those who would then be living nearer the station.</p> <p><b>Over-development of Tring</b></p> <p>I have commented elsewhere about the need to revise the plan as government policy changes to develop the north over the south of the country.</p> <p>I have also commented elsewhere about the need for <b>appropriate infrastructure</b> to accompany a 50% increase in population e.g. primary medical care, grocery shopping, town centre parking, the needs of Brook St, railway station parking, recycling facilities, and the need to preserve the Local History Museum building as part of <b>Tring's character</b>.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS285
<b>Person ID</b>	1258956
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Boyes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have heard today that there is a development plan, proposing building a further 3000 homes in Tring, The volume of traffic through Tring and along Brook Street is heavy, with traffic heading towards the A41 or Tring School. As you are aware Brook Street is one way traffic passed the the Silk Mill Industrial Estate</p> <p>The Fire Station and Tring Auction are part of Tring's heritage, which are irreplaceable. The town attracts so many visitors due its quaintness.</p> <p>Tring needs to be protected, otherwise it will lose its heritage and identity.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS286
<b>Person ID</b>	1259008
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The scale of the proposed development is deeply concerning. Whilst I understand the need for growth, these plans will inherantly change what Tring is; a small and community oriented market town. A 55% growth rate over this period is unfathomabe, given the infrasture and amenities that are already under stress. The affects that this will have on our wildlife in the proposed areas is surely a huge issue that seemingly has not been given proper consideration. I oppose such significant development and hope this can be reconsidered.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS337

<b>Person ID</b>	1259867
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Rook
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1259862
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Janet Rook
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am commenting on <b>Tring</b> (not Berkhamsted as the misprint above suggests)</p> <p><b>23.136</b> As your plan says, Tring is an area of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>Why it is necessary to create a major development on green belt land and an AONB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>'The NPPF demands that there should be "exceptional circumstances" before Green Belt boundaries can be changed and says that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should be approved only in "very special circumstances.'</i> This briefing is from the House of Commons Library. 20.11.20</li> </ul> <p>You admit in your draft infrastructure plan that...</p> <p><i>20.6 Key issues for the Tring include</i></p> <p><i>'New development could harm the setting of the Chilterns AONB, the Grand Union Canal and other interests of acknowledged importance'.</i></p> <p><b>23.137</b> Tring is architecturally rich and so why are you proposing to build a supermarket in the middle of the town to ruin this character?</p> <p><b>23.139</b> Where are your detailed plans for sustainable transport for the 21st century? 21st century infrastructure is about a zero carbon footprint, electrified transport, automated vehicles, cycle paths, and walking routes. Not more roads for petrol and diesel powered vehicles.</p> <p>You say that growth will be sustainable transport / accessibility and infrastructure led but The Tring LA5 development cannot be accessed by a cycle path and there is <b>no</b> cycle path from there to Tring Station.</p> <p>In your draft infrastructure plan you say..</p> <p><i>Highways and Transportation</i></p>

20.11 Tring as a settlement already has a sustainable transport infrastructure in the form of the rail and bus networks.....Ensuring connectivity e.g. pedestrian/cycle links between the growth sites and existing neighbourhoods and the town centre and railways will be important in realising the most sustainable approach to transport.

How can you claim that the current diesel bus services are sustainable?

I cannot find a map of proposed pedestrian and cycle path links. Please can you inform me where these paths will be. They should as your plans suggest be in place BEFORE development in order to establish transport habits of new residents.

There is no clear stipulation to ensure housing is supplied by 'green' energy in order to meet climate change/carbon neutral obligations to which the government is committed.

*'UK homes are not fit for the future. Greenhouse gas emission reductions from UK housing have stalled, and efforts to adapt the housing stock for higher temperatures, flooding and water scarcity are falling far behind the increase in risk from the changing climate. The quality, design and use of homes across the UK must be improved now to address the challenges of climate change'*. Committee on Climate Change February 2019

*'We support the intention of the Government's proposals to future-proof new build homes with low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency.'* Local Government Assoc Feb 2020

**23.140** 21st century town centres will look very different after COVID and should look very different so that they meet community needs of providing a focal meeting point for the community where facilities such as repair shops are placed in order to support sustainability plans. Where are your plans to meet these needs?

**23.142** 2,730 new dwellings amounts to a 50% increase in the size of Tring. Such a development will completely change the character of this Chiltern town. This is more than DBC's own evidence base says we need. Are we to understand that the size of this development is simply to get developers to part fund the necessary schooling the area will require?

**23.144** *This will include significant green infrastructure provision in the form of open space and an ecological buffer to the GUC, and a connecting corridor of open space through to Grove Road.*

**Das Gupta Report** (The Review was commissioned in 2019 by HM Treasury) says

*'it is less costly to conserve Nature than it is to restore it', p 71* Abridged version.

*'Nature's worth to society – the true value of the various goods and services it provides – is not reflected in market prices because much of it is open to all at no monetary charge. These pricing distortions have led us to invest relatively more in other assets, such as produced capital, and underinvest in our natural asset p. 2* abridged version Das Gupta'

How is the loss of a Local Wildlife Site and a mixed farm which has benefited from Higher Level Stewardship, consistent with Sustainable Development?

How is the loss of all of Dunsley Farm area consistent with enhancing biodiversity on HCC land as outlined in their Sustainability Strategy?

How is the loss of two functional farms which provide management capacity and contribute to the management requirements of other land locally, consistent with Sustainable Development?

How does building on Dunsley Farm meet your aim of being sensitive to the heritage of Tring?

It is by preserving small local farms that we protect the heritage of the town. By removing these things you take away what makes Tring so special today. Is your aim to turn the town into just another faceless modern development with identikit housing and no character? Are these considerations important to you?

**23.147** **Bullet point 4.** Green corridors need to be properly planned. They will be used by various species at various times for various purposes - moving, feeding, possibly breeding etc but only if they are suitable in size and nature.

**23.150** The suggested site is only a couple of hundred yards from the existing supermarket! It would merely draw more traffic to the town centre. To be sustainable we need to reduce journeys and use of cars, therefore the site of a new supermarket should serve another part of Tring e.g. west Tring near LA5 .

You have not considered **where** most customers to a new supermarket would come from. Large numbers come from the surrounding villages to the north of Tring. Some of these villages are in Bucks. e.g. Pitstone is expanding fast but has no supermarket and so people shop in Tring. (You have not given any consideration to the fact that Tring is surrounded by Buckinghamshire where there is already extensive development in Aylesbury and surrounds)

Delivery to a Brook Street site would be very difficult because of access via a narrow road.

**23.151** But there is no joined up thinking about cycle routes in Tring. If you are trying to reduce carbon footprint you would encourage cycling to the station from all parts of town, but there is currently no cycle route from LA5 to the station. Instead there seems to be the suggestion of a cycle path to the Aston Clinton roundabout on the A41, but very few in Tring would need to go in that direction by bike. Most traffic would be to the shops and the station thus going in the opposite direction to the suggested route. Infrastructure must be in place before housing is developed in order to establish sustainable patterns of travel behaviours suited to reducing our carbon footprint and meeting your sustainability criteria. ref. **LTP 4 (2018-31)**

**23.152** The road in Tring High Street are very narrow especially from Akeman Street to the Robin Hood pub. Pavements are also dangerously narrow on this section.

**23.153** To make the town more accessible by foot, pedestrianize the section mentioned above in 23.152 and divert traffic around the edge of Tring as happened recently for months during the laying of gas pipes. This would allow the beautiful centre of Tring with ancient Church and the Rothschild style Rose and Crown as well as the History Museum to take centre stage.)

**23.157** Please advise where the map for this proposed cycle path is.

**23.158** Blue skies thinking is required for access to Tring Station. Your plans are stuck in the 20th century. A regular reliable electric bus service doing a loop from the town centre to the station would considerably reduce the need for car parking space. (With a similar route to Pitstone) Also if this is a plan to the 2030's automated transport could easily be a part of development plans.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS382

**Person ID** 1260058

**Full Name** Redbourn Parish Council

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1260042

**Agent Full Name** David Mitchell

**Agent Organisation** Redbourn Parish Council

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS430

**Person ID** 1260403

**Full Name** Ms Dorothy Armstrong

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed plans that are being considered by Dacorum Borough Council to build 2,731 new houses in Tring. This is more than a 55% increase in the size of Tring.</p> <p>I believe this would destroy the local landscape. Also, ruining the picturesque and unique small market town that Tring possesses.</p> <p>I understand that there is a need to build more houses, but not by this vast amount also ruining the Green Belt. The infrastructure in Tring cannot cope now with the current population. Also, I understand that many Tring residents oppose these plans.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS431
<b>Person ID</b>	1142796
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Saunders
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.142: The current medical facilities in Tring are struggling to cope with the existing population. The proposed inflation in population will require additional medical facilities, with their own, adequate parking facilities.</p> <p>23.142: Tring's increased population will need better access to appropriate recycling facilities. The existing Dacorum facility in Berkhamsted will not be sufficient as it will have to accommodate the large number of extra houses proposed for Berkhamsted, as well as Tring's.</p> <p>23.150: The Local History Museum's current building and location is part of the heritage and character of Tring. This will be lost if the museum is relocated to a new building, on a different site.</p> <p>23.152: The plan acknowledges the current congestion at Brook street. This can only be made much worse by providing a foodstore in this area. This will significantly add to car traffic in this area,</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS438
<b>Person ID</b>	1260486
<b>Full Name</b>	Jenny Brannock Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly, it is the Tring Strategy, not Berkhamsted. Paragraph 23.162.</p> <p>"One of the largest growth areas in the Borough". Tring is only the third largest settlement but is to have a huge expansion. This will completely transform the nature of a market town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS472
<b>Person ID</b>	1260643
<b>Full Name</b>	Carl Baiden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring is a small market town with a special and unique character in this part of Hertfordshire. These plans will almost double the size of the town and create another bland urban sprawl and ruin the area's natural appeal.</p> <p>Local amenities will be overwhelmed - there is no mention of provision for increased medical facilities and emergency services.</p> <p>The museum and auction rooms are being swept away.</p> <p>Huge areas of the green environment will be destroyed, at a time when we need more green areas, not less - there is a climate emergency ongoing.</p> <p>People don't go food shopping by foot or bicycle - creating lots of paths and cycleways will do nothing to stop an exponential increase in traffic. This will affect Tring and the villages to the North, where the road infrastructure is crumbling and overwhelmed with commuter and heavy good traffic. A distributor road will just encourage more through traffic and building commercial and warehouse premises will just make matters worse.</p> <p>Paragraphs 23.152 and 23.153 play down current traffic congestion in Tring - the authors have clearly not visited at busy times of the day and especially in the High Street, or Brook Street.</p> <p>It is stated that the provision of non-food shops is not significant. This will lead to many thousands of people driving to larger towns to shop, thus adding more cars to the roads.</p> <p>This plan needs to be revised downwards - we all accept that more homes are needed but not on this scale in this area.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS473
<b>Person ID</b>	1258240
<b>Full Name</b>	Adele Giles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I will start by making similar comments I made for Berkhamsted - The whole amounts to over-development and will totally ruin this historic market town. If development is allowed to take place on this scale, before long Dacorum will be amount to a linear conurbation from the M25 along the length of the A41 to Tring. The suggested proposals seem to take</p>

advantage of all the attractive qualities of this commuter town to the benefit of property development companies rather than the needs of the community.

If these proposals are allowed to go ahead, Tring will no longer be 'One of the most sustainable towns in the Borough'. Almost doubling the population will have a huge negative impact on the character of the town and it's position at the foot of the Chilterns, surrounded by AONB. Removing more land from Green Belt around the town seems to be totally against the Government's new methodology in prioritising development in urban areas. How will biodiversity be achieved and maintained in this situation?

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS528

**Person ID**

1260818

**Full Name**

Mr John Wright

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Re the plan to build further houses in Tring using the market car park, auction and fire station site plus a further 3000 on green belt land.

We have lived in Tring over 30 years, we love the town as it looks NOW! We do not want to live in a concrete jungle, which is what you seem determined to create. The town has character and history, which again you seem determined to erase. If houses are needed, Tring is not a suitable location, the infrastructure cannot support a further influx of people and their vehicles. Have you looked at the town centre on a Saturday (obviously prior to lockdown measures)? The traffic is at standstill. The car park is always full and the side streets parked to capacity. I have tried many times to get a doctor's appointment and failed as they are always fully booked, schools are at capacity and are turning away local children.

The new housing estate on Icknield Way (again on green belt land) has not yet been completed, this in time will add more cars, more people to overload the various systems, but now you plan to further overload the area, but this time by destroying the character of the Town at the same time!

Tring is a nice place to live, but by removing the history, overloading the infrastructure and covering it with concrete will ruin our home town for us and our children.  
Please stop trying to vandalise our historic town!

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS533

**Person ID** 1266579

**Full Name** JUANITA ARKELL-HARDWICK

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I don't normally speak in this sort of situation but the impact that these developments will have on the Tring Community has made me feel I must.

I, as well as so many others in the Tring community are totally overwhelmed by the developments that are being proposed in Tring.

As you know, Tring is a small town with a great sense of community spirit. People love it here because it is not over populated or crowded. People have space to be happy. This will all be ripped away from the community if all these new homes were to be built as Tring would become very over populated and crowed, doubling in size.

You just need to walk down Marshcroft Lane/ Station road to see all the families enjoying open space to walk, to teach their children to bike ride, roller skate, take their dogs for joyful walks or just walk in nature to breathe and to get some clear head space. It is a fact that having a space to enjoy nature is incredibly positive for ones mental health. How wonderful that families can do this all on their doorstep. Where would they go if you built over these areas?

How sad is it that these days it is a privilege to be able to walk to some open space and not have to get in a car and drive to somewhere you can go and enjoy a bit of nature. At this moment we have that privilege in Tring. Sadly not for much longer if your developments go ahead as all those areas will be built on.

The impact on the environment in this area would be devastating if houses were built all over the open spaces that all of Tring enjoy. Your sense of community would be no more. It would just become another faceless area of brick built

homes with not enough space for people to live, let alone park their cars. Statistically you never have a happy community where overcrowding is an issue. The quaint High Street and High Street parking will no longer be sufficient. This is an area that has no further space for further developments.

Already oversubscribed doctors and dentists surgeries will be overwhelmed by a Tring twice the size. It is already difficult to get appointments, imagine what it will be like once Tring has grown so vastly.

At this moment Tring is still one of the few quaint, wonderful little towns in this area. There are many other built up areas that could take this quota of new builds without the huge impact that it would have on Tring. To these larger towns(Hemel, Watford, Aylesbury, Milton Keynes, just to name a few) it would just be another suburb but to Tring this amount of development would change it for ever, from a lovely small town into an equivalent of the towns we already have, mentioned above.

There is so much to lose here. Please build these extra houses in larger towns and areas that have already got the infrastructures that will be needed to support those that will be living in them.

Our open spaces are so regularly used and a part of many of the communities every day life.

Please don't take that away from them.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS555
<b>Person ID</b>	1253595
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Lindsey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I believe your plans for the Tring Centre are with the fairies given that the High Street is dying. Over 50% of the shops and offices on either side of Dolphin Square are vacant; Tring is in decline; I really cannot see why any retail or commercial business would locate in Tring Centre. The parking is expensive, driving residents to shop in Aylesbury. In deed, DBC could rejuvenate the whole of Dacorum if it provided 4-hours free parking in each of its retail centres. The trouble is DBC lacks the vision to realise this. Councillors are driven simply to gain revenue from motorists not realising that this is driving consumers to shop in neighbouring areas with better facilities.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS637
<b>Person ID</b>	1261183
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Fairfull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.</p> <p>My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.</p> <p>The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.</p> <p>Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity? You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan. It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.</p> <p>Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between</p>

properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.

These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.

In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS658
<b>Person ID</b>	1261122
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This will change the nature of Tring, but is it necessary or wanted by anyone? I suspect not. The developments between Tring and Tring Station will ruin the area of natural beauty, sheep, crops, fields, hills, flooding etc. Access will require fundamental restructuring of the road network. None of this expansion is sustainable in the sense that the town will not retain its existing character.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS684
<b>Person ID</b>	1261235
<b>Full Name</b>	John Donnithorne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Tring does not have the infrastructure to cope with many more houses/developments. Prior to Covid most Friday lunchtimes it is difficult to find a parking space in Tring town centre. Frequently, Tesco car park is full or close to being full. The Doctor's surgery is always busy. Could Tring school cope with such an increase in pupils? Why do we need to build on Green Belt land?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS757
<b>Person ID</b>	1261250
<b>Full Name</b>	Christina Thompson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I do not agree with the use of green belt land for development in Tring and the destruction of farmland. The proposals for Tring are out of all proportion with the rest of Dacorum and will destroy the character of the town.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS817
<b>Person ID</b>	1163063
<b>Full Name</b>	Diana Woodward
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to the development of proposed site Tr01, on the southern side of Tring. It will destroy the attractive and precious landscape situated on the main entrance to the town, surrounded by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and close to a conservation area. I have lived in this area of Herts/Bucks on and off since 1955 and have come to see that this landscape, located only some 30 miles from central London, can only be kept for the enjoyment of future generations through its active protection. The more that it is nibbled away by development (be it housing, HS2, industrial development or road construction), the less valuable it becomes, the less attractive to its residents, and the greater the threat to its indigenous flora and fauna. I will be moving to central Tring within the next couple of months, and deplore these plans which would overdevelop a highly visible and valued green corner of this pretty town.</p> <p>Irreparable harm would be done to the unique character of the historic market town, which must be preserved for current and future generations. This side of Tring is noted for its historic Rothschild architecture and its green open spaces and parks. The northern end of Tring is already undergoing major development with a large housing complex, on a greenfield site, which on current evidence will not enhance the area with distinguished or appropriately vernacular architectural house styles. Please do not spoil this lovely little town by ruining the southern end, too, with more high-density housing and industrial development. I might feel slightly less hostile if the proposed housing was more contemporary, with eco features and car-free zones, instead of having mass housing which will make Tring look like any other town, paying no heed to local styles or to current progressive thinking in architecture and construction. The new housing I have viewed</p>

recently in Tring (in the upper range of local house prices) is more characteristic of the 20th century than the 21st. The architecture is bog standard, with no acknowledgement of local building styles, there is a disinclination to use new heating and ventilation technologies or renewable energy sources, the houses have driveways but no garages (forcing people to park their cars in their front gardens), and poor insulation (in relation to what self-builders would install, of which I have been one). The plot sizes are tiny, compared with other European countries and UK self-build houses, with little space for homeworking or children's play outside. Standard high density housing is surely likely to be even worse in all these respects.

I am also unhappy about the plan to have industrial units along the A4251. This is not an industrial area. (The nearest such units are half a mile away in the Silk Mill park, repurposing a former industrial site.) I don't count the small businesses based in Dunsley Farm as they are not very visible from the road and anyway they form part of the farm complex. They are not a purpose-built industrial complex like the ugly industrial estate along Icknield Way, on the north side of Tring. Such buildings are functional, not attractive, and so would further degrade the open landscape opposite the pretty Rothschild gatehouse at the bottom of The Twist and opposite the northern end of the Tring Park estate.

A new major road junction is proposed for Cow Lane (which is already heavily congested at busy times) and at least two new major road junctions are proposed onto the London Road. These will cause serious environmental harm - congestion, noise, air pollution, etc - for all of Tring's residents, businesses and visitors. These new access points are exclusively on the east and south of the proposed site, thereby limiting journey options and causing indirect journeys and congestion. Apart from the A4251, which regularly gets blocked up by funeral processions and parked lorries unloading, Tring is relatively uncongested - a much appreciated aspect of the town - and this would be lost if Tr01 is developed.

Who will undertake to ensure that Tring has sufficient infrastructure to support this proposed development? I note that a new primary school is proposed but I don't see any promises about meeting other needs, such as a new bus service to the station, or an extension to Tring secondary school. At busy times it is already difficult to park in central Tring and there is only one GP surgery, with utterly inadequate parking, and the building seems to be full to bursting.

If Tring has to expand its housing stock, is the current development on its northern flank not sufficient? I am very much opposed to the loss of this attractive green corner at its southern entrance, which is very visible to visitors and residents alike.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS845

**Person ID** 1261436

**Full Name** SALLY MARSTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed number of houses 2,700 is very heavily weighted on Tring compared with the rest of Dacorum, and there is not the infrastructure in Tring to support such a large development. Nor does the planning include enough new resources to support such a development. In particular medical services in Tring are supported by only one surgery and for some time now people have been complaining how long it takes to contact the surgery by phone, it can take a whole morning to make contact. Then you are lucky to be able to make an appointment within 3 weeks unless you are an exceptional emergency.</p> <p>Parking in town will become very difficult and there is not available space to provide more parking, and traffic along the High Street will be overloaded. Parking at the station is not sufficient at the moment despite the recent expansion, at it is useless to claim people will walk to the station because the vast majority have busy lives and it will take too long. So there will be overflow parking in the streets all around the station.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS865
<b>Person ID</b>	211406
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jennifer Habib
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chiltern Society Planning Field Officer for Dacorum Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There are approximately 5,000 new houses proposed, just for Tring and Berkhamsted, which would increase their joint population by half as much again. Every house will hold at least four people and two cars, some houses many more, roughly 20,000 people and 10,000 cars to be expected over time.

- 1 No allowance has been made for extra Doctors, more School places at each level including the sixth form college, nor transport services [new bus routes, existing road widening, new roads, new larger car parking areas for the shops] in the plan, but these will undoubtedly be needed and there is no budget for them. The cost of these will be many millions and there is no way they can be paid for by house building contractors.
- 2 There is already a shortage of public open space within the towns especially Berkhamsted so any new building should incorporate far more than is shown. This will put too much pressure on the Ashridge National Trust area and the surrounding Countryside. Due to Brexit our farmers will be able to farm all their land, as the EU quota system no longer applies, so we need the farms to grow our meat and vegetables and should not build on them.
- 3 The plans seriously impinge on the existing and supposedly protected Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is actually proposing to build over an existing Cricket and Football pitch, despite the fact that Berkhamsted is officially lacking in public open space. The Government is putting more stress on protecting green spaces as well as the Green Belt.
- 4 The Government is also stressing the need to protect wild life and the natural environment, but these plans eliminate the wild life corridors and areas of special interest at present protected, will the destroy huge areas of habitat, create light pollution from all the new street lamps, plus human disturbance which will destroy wild life.
- 5 If these proposals go ahead the entire character of both areas will change beyond repair. The planned housing touches the borders of the AONB and has completely removed the protective areas of Green Belt around them and also the Green Belt separating the towns. [which is the main reason for the Green belt] The Government has recently stated that Housing is not a reason for losing Green Belt areas and also that AONB areas are precious, their character is irreplaceable and must be retained together with the valuable wild life spaces and travel corridors previously planned.. The Government also said that the first principle of new housing is that it should be built on brown field sites, also that affordable housing is a local priority, there is no mention of brown Field site use.
- 6 If these plans are built there will be a great need for new sources to be found for the water supply. The Chalk Streams of the Chilterns are a National Treasure. The water companies already take more water than is advisable from them , yet still we have water shortages every hot summer and calls for hose bans. A new reservoir for the area, capable of supplying the extra 60,000 gallons per day which will be needed, together with a new water treatment plant and water collection from the street drainage will be needed, but there is no budget or suggested plans for this.
- 7 Similarly the current sewage disposal system for the two towns is already overloaded because of the volume of new housing already built in the last 5 years. For this level of new housing a new sewage treatment plant and new main sewers will be needed, also not shown.
- 8 To keep up with the need for much more electric power to be made available to support electric cars and support our government's plans for climate change, [the reduction of gas use for heating and cooking] other ways must be used.
- 9 Every new building should be heated by heat exchangers underground and roofed with photovoltaic cells, which are available in roof tiles rather than in ugly black panels.. This has been done with great success by several leading architects and should now be made compulsory for all new housing.

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS884
<b>Person ID</b>	876510
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Simon Ware
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a local resident of Tring, I wanted to raise my objections to the Local Plan proposed developments for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The areas being proposed are all on greenbelt and should therefore be protected. It is my understanding that under the NPPF greenbelt can be built on only under exceptional circumstances. As there is little brownfield available, then an exceptional case in Dacorum will mean that greenbelt can be built on.</li> <li>2 When Tring Parish Council backed LA5, it was understood that if not agreed that other development on greenbelt would be undertaken. Yet only 3 years later we are being asked to agree to yet more greenfield being built on.</li> <li>3 I do not agree that building on greenbelt is sustainable and is in line with climate change targets. Building on greenbelt destroys natural habitats and will only lead to more localised flooding, road congestion and poor air quality within Tring.</li> <li>4 Tring does not have the infrastructure to support any more development. There are insufficient school places, doctors etc and the central road through Tring is very narrow.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS930
<b>Person ID</b>	1264329
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIC MILLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>There are approximately 5,000 new houses proposed, just for Tring and Berkhamsted, which would increase their joint population by half as much again. Every house will hold at least four people and two cars, some houses many more, roughly 20,000 people and 10,000 cars to be expected over time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 No allowance has been made for extra Doctors, more School places at each level including the sixth form college, nor <u>transport services</u> [new bus routes, existing road widening, <u>new roads</u>, new larger car parking areas for the shops] in the plan, but these will undoubtedly be needed and there is no budget for them. The cost of these will be many millions and there is no way they can be paid for by house building contractors.</li> <li>2 There is already a shortage of public open space within the towns especially Berkhamsted so any new building should incorporate far more than is shown. This will put too much pressure on the Ashridge National Trust area and the surrounding Countryside. Due to Brexit our farmers will be able to farm all their land, as the EU quota system no longer applies, so we need the farms to grow our meat and vegetables and should not build on them.</li> <li>3 The plans seriously impinge on the existing and supposedly protected Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is actually proposing to build over an existing Cricket and Football pitch, despite the fact that Berkhamsted is officially lacking in public open space. The Government is putting more stress on protecting green spaces as well as the Green Belt.</li> <li>4 The Government is also stressing the need to protect wild life and the natural environment, but these plans eliminate the wild life corridors and areas of special interest at present protected, will the destroy huge areas of habitat, create light pollution from all the new street lamps, plus human disturbance which will destroy wild life.</li> <li>5 If these proposals go ahead the entire character of both areas will change beyond repair. The planned housing touches the borders of the <u>AONB</u> and has completely removed the protective areas of Green Belt around them and also the Green Belt separating the towns. [which is the main reason for the Green belt] The Government has recently stated that Housing is not a reason for losing Green Belt areas and also that AONB areas are precious, their character is irreplaceable and must be retained together with the valuable wild life spaces and travel corridors previously planned.. The Government also said that the first principle of new housing is that it should be built on brown field sites, also that affordable housing is a local priority, there is no mention of brown Field site use.</li> <li>6 If these plans are built there will be a great need for new sources to be found for the <u>water supply</u>. The Chalk Streams of the Chilterns are a National Treasure. The water companies already take more water than is advisable from them , yet still we have water shortages every hot summer and calls for hose bans. A new reservoir for the area, capable of supplying the extra 60,000 gallons per day which will be needed, together with a new water treatment plant and water collection from the street drainage will be needed, but there is no budget or suggested plans for this.</li> </ol>

- 7 Similarly the current sewage disposal system for the two towns is already overloaded because of the volume of new housing already built in the last 5 years. For this level of new housing a new sewage treatment plant and new main sewers will be needed, also not shown.
- 8 To keep up with the need for much more electric power to be made available to support electric cars and support our government's plans for climate change, [the reduction of gas use for heating and cooking] other ways must be used.
- 9 Every new building should be heated by heat exchangers underground and roofed with photovoltaic cells, which are available in roof tiles rather than in ugly black panels.. This has been done with great success by several leading architects and should now be made compulsory for all new housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS940

**Person ID** 1259860

**Full Name** Mark Fawcett

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I have tried to comment via the planning website but cannot see how to do this, it seems a very difficult process.

I wanted to express my deep concerns at the frankly horrifying development proposals for Tring, the town that I am a resident.

To almost double the population of such a small market town makes no logical sense and in no way in line with Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted developments.

Tring residents are proud of their town, the appeal is due to the small historical market town character - to build thousands of houses is entirely unacceptable to me and many of our fellow residents, Tring simply does not have the need or infrastructure for such a vulgar number of new houses, this is not Hemel Hempstead and surely the number of houses must be a small percentage, perhaps 5-10% of the existing residency - 55% is frankly ludicrous.

I would like to officially complain about the proposals



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS966
<b>Person ID</b>	1261561
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jonathan Whitehead
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am taking this opportunity to oppose the planned development of Tring and the further destruction of the green belt around Tring. Enough is enough.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS975
<b>Person ID</b>	1261596
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Terry Quoroll
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object to the sheer scale of the proposed strategic developments to TRING which will clearly overwhelm the character and nature of the town and the local environment. It is the scale of development that i object to rather than the development itself.</p> <p>Any development needs to consider the requirements of infrastructure not just schools and shops but dentists doctors etc as well as accessing major roads. Access to the A41 is problematic now and chokes the High Street continually in "rush hour"</p> <p>We are already experiencing a development at the other end of town without any apparent consideration of school places and affordable housing....£495k!</p> <p>I understand there is also an under way review which could determine the requirements to build as lower so it seems sensible to defer to that review rather than proceed at this stage.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS994
<b>Person ID</b>	1261641
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Nandi Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My comments pertain to the Tring Local Development Plan only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the number of houses planned for Tring (2700) compared to the current population and the housing plans in other areas, such as Berkhamstead are disproportionately large, resulting in a nearly 55% increase in housing compared to smaller increases in other locations and this number does not seem clearly explained or substantiated by evidence. It also seems far in excess of understood demographic increases of the area.</li> <li>- there is a lack of clear commitment and assurance that these 2700 houses will be designed and built with sufficient care and consideration to the environment and climate commitments. Commitment must be made that these houses will be carbon neutral, and will NOT rely on any fossil or non-renewable energy sources and should include clear requirements for ground source, solar, or other carbon neutral energy. This assurance should be provided regardless of builders and developers preferences to align with the clear priority of the local, national and international governments on climate change.</li> </ul>

- it is not clear how the housing will reflect the local character of the town and not be generic off plan "estate" style new builds. Confirmation that considerations of the character and history of Tring as a historic market town in an area of outstanding natural beauty is needed to ensure sensitive construction not sprawling, generic, unsympathetic estates.
- in addition environmental considerations - particularly the protection and indeed, enhancement of the environment must be safeguarded. The plan seems vague on key environmental and protection issues such as wildlife corridors and does not adequately offset the incredible damage that will result due to the loss of hedgerows and construction and development on green belts and other protected areas.
- it is important to clearly define and distinguish between green recreational spaces (such as the cricket, football and rugby club lands) with protected wildlife spaces and greenbelts. Protecting recreational spaces is welcome and essential but is NOT the same as protecting wildlife routes and greenbelts and these should not be confused with each other or be seen to be interchangeable as is currently indicated in this plan. Equally screen planting for noise along a road / corridor is NOT the same as replanting or woodland planting for wildlife and the two should not be confused or interchanged.
- the development plan does not appear to have been developed clearly in consideration of development plans, resources and facilities in Bucks despite Tring being surrounded on 2 sides by Bucks and its proximity to Aylesbury. Review of the Tring plan in light of the development plans of Bucks and specifically the Aylesbury Vale is required and should be clearly assessed and then communicated to stakeholders before finalising the plans for Tring.
- The increase of retail space in Tring is welcome but needs further clarification on how much development will take place in the current high street of Tring which is already congested in terms of traffic access. Has consideration of pedestrianisation been included and, or the possibility of more relevant, modern approaches to retail "experiences" that could better reflect the current retail demands and profiles rather than focussing on high street and centralisation style retail facilities that enhances Tring's market town ethos.
- the need for an additional secondary school is only required due to the addition of the proposed houses - there is an impression in the plan that the houses have to be built in order to fund a new secondary school and this is misleading and disingenuous. It is also not clear how and when the school(s) as well as other services (dentists? GP surgeries? sports facilities?) will be built - will this be after all houses are built and potentially for many years not available to the increased population and pressure on current resources, or as part of the development process.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS995

**Person ID** 1261642

**Full Name** Colin Rees

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the increase of housing in Tring.</p> <p>The appeal of Tring is that it is a small market town surrounded by green belt land.</p> <p>The proposed increase in housing by 55% building on green belt land is out of keeping with a small town like Tring.</p> <p>I notice that the advert for the development at Roman Park is selling their unaffordable houses on the benefits of Tring being a small market town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1034
<b>Person ID</b>	864907
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Lea
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Traffic issues that would result in growing Tring's size by more than 50% would be huge. Additional car movements from the developments to the east of the town and associated changes to the town centre are unsustainable. There is already not enough spaces to park in the Town with the current population. The High Street has no loading possible for any of its businesses, so the traffic is already impossible for most occasions with any deliveries. Brook Street is in effect a single track for significant parts of its length and any additional traffic would in effect make it impassable</p> <p>Infrastructure in the town is not set up for a bigger population Doctors numbers can be increased but there is not effectively there is no space for building extra space or parking that would be needed for 50% extra people. Shops that would be added to the town for the extra development would have nowhere to go without destroying the character of a small market town.</p>

Schools and choice in Tring are already an illusion. People to the west of the town are not able to access the schools in that area with people needing to live within 600 metres of the school for the last academic year. This means the 200 extra homes under construction already will not be able to gain a place at their closest school and possibly within the town at all.

Building over the largest inland oil pipeline in the UK to the east of Tring is an unneeded risk that could be located elsewhere in the district.

Within Dacorum, there are other significant areas of Brownfield sites that could be used for housing. There is likely to be major changes in the working patterns following on from the Covid pandemic that make the need for development on Green belt an unnecessary extravagance. That should be resisted in all but the most exceptional circumstances which this is clearly not.

The Green Belt area around Tring to the East are a significant barrier to urban sprawl into the significant countryside of the Chiltern Hills. I also note that the land has been bought and sold in a way that makes it look like this consultation is already a done deal. Are you listening to me or is this an illusion of democracy? There is a completely disproportionate sharing of the numbers of houses in this proposal. Tring is the smallest town in the district with the least infrastructure or facilities to cope with significant additional new homes and yet the proposal is for Tring to have more than 50% more homes. I can only conclude that this proposal has some sort of bias or lack of inventive thinking.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1035
<b>Person ID</b>	871298
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Deborah Lea
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Traffic issues that would result in growing Tring's size by more than 50% would be huge. Additional car movements from the developments to the east of the town and associated changes to the town centre are unsustainable. There is already not enough spaces to park in the Town with the current population. The High Street has no loading possible for any of its businesses, so the traffic is already impossible for most occasions with any deliveries. Brook Street is in effect a single track for significant parts of its length and any additional traffic would in effect make it impassable

Infrastructure in the town is not set up for a bigger population Doctors numbers can be increased but there is not effectively there is no space for building extra space or parking that would be needed for 50% extra people. Shops that would be added to the town for the extra development would have nowhere to go without destroying the character of a small market town.

Schools and choice in Tring are already an illusion. People to the west of the town are not able to access the schools in that area with people needing to live within 600 metres of the school for the last academic year. This means the 200 extra homes under construction already will not be able to gain a place at their closest school and possibly within the town at all.

Building over the largest inland oil pipeline in the UK to the east of Tring is an unneeded risk that could be located elsewhere in the district.

Within Dacorum, there are other significant areas of Brownfield sites that could be used for housing. There is likely to be major changes in the working patterns following on from the Covid pandemic that make the need for development on Green belt an unnecessary extravagance. That should be resisted in all but the most exceptional circumstances which this is clearly not.

The Green Belt area around Tring to the East are a significant barrier to urban sprawl into the significant countryside of the Chiltern Hills. I also note that the land has been bought and sold in a way that makes it look like this consultation is already a done deal. Are you listening to me or is this an illusion of democracy? There is a completely disproportionate sharing of the numbers of houses in this proposal. Tring is the smallest town in the district with the least infrastructure or facilities to cope with significant additional new homes and yet the proposal is for Tring to have more than 50% more homes. I can only conclude that this proposal has some sort of bias or lack of inventive thinking.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1051
<b>Person ID</b>	1261670
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Olivia Simpson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

## Tring Delivery Strategy comment

I strongly object to the Dacorum Local Plan which proposes 16,600 new homes to be built primarily on 850 hectares of green belt around Tring, Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead in the next 18 years. This growth in household numbers is a 25% increase over the current housing stock. which would irrevocably change the character of our towns and villages and destroy valuable green belt habitat and amenity. Dacorum Borough have chosen to accept these Central Government imposed growth figures that are not substantiated by evidence and are based upon outdated ONS projections and an arbitrary and simplistic algorithm.

I support the need for a local plan and accept the need to build a reasonable number of new sustainable and affordable properties in the Borough. The latest ONS data available projects 6051 new homes in Dacorum by 2038 – 64% FEWER than this plan projects.

In this plan, thousands of new homes are simply bolted onto the perimeters of our existing towns over green belt land with inadequate thought to the pressures on water supplies, traffic needs, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements). There is little sustainable about the construction nor preserving of our heritage about this plan.

Rather than as an afterthought, sustainability should be at the absolute core of the proposed future developments in the Local Plan, as recommended by national planning guidance. This draft Local Plan fails to demonstrate a pathway to local zero carbon or enhancements to biodiversity. The plan is unambitious and does not commit to any level of sustainability in its sustainability targets. The proposed plan has clearly prioritised house building growth over considerations for the climate emergency. Several local authorities in England (e.g., Greater Cambridge, Reading and Liverpool City) have developed integrated local plans that take account of climate change, biodiversity, well-being and social inclusion. Beyond some fine words, there is no evidence in the proposed Local Plan of a viable action plan to deliver such an approach.

We must ensure the Local Plan commits to all new homes to be certified zero carbon and sustainable in order to address the climate emergency.

I call for:

- The number of new houses proposed in the plan to be substantially reduced.
- Dacorum to implement a local plan that includes firm and ambitious sustainable commitments. I believe all new buildings should be designed to meet the highest externally certified sustainability standards and to be at least net-zero carbon (including Scope 3 emissions). Examples include: Every property with a parking space to have an electric vehicle charger built into it. Every property to have a dual aspect to allow for natural ventilation. All new homes must incorporate solar PVs and other appropriate sustainable sources. No new building should be directly reliant on fossil fuels for heating (i.e. no gas boilers) and each home should collect rain water for toilets. The homes must have top class insulation. These standards should be mandatory for all developers in the Local Plan.
- Trees and woodland are very valuable to the environment and the community's physical and mental health. I welcome the commitment in the plan to retain existing trees but in order to compensate for any removal of green belt it is vital that we seek a commitment that new mixed woodland and re-wilding, with public access, be planted close to, and be integral to, each new major development area.
- An increase in habitat for wildlife must be incorporated into any green field development areas including wildlife corridors.

- Recreational corridors should be incorporated within new built-up areas to promote cycling and pedestrian access through the development and provide connectivity with the existing town and the countryside boundaries. These routes should not be limited to narrow, dark alleyways but should be several metres wide with natural vegetation to make travelling pleasantly airy and to support bio-diversity.
- The Local Plan should allocate land for new allotments for resident of new homes as well as laying out gardens to support 'Growing your own'(which is both sustainable and good for mental health) • Public transport must be greatly improved both to connect these new homes to their town centres but also to reduce traffic congestion on the roads which cannot be widened. Well connected and maintained dedicated cycle routes throughout our towns must be implemented along with secure bike storage.

We are facing a climate emergency and addressing this must be at the absolute core of Dacorum's Local Plan. Currently it is not. We have the knowledge and technology to make good affordable zero carbon sustainable homes. The Local Plan must prioritise this.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1062

**Person ID** 1261677

**Full Name** Gosia Turczyn

**Organisation Details** Aldbury Parish Clerk  
Aldbury Parish Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** Aldbury Parish Council believes that the proposed development in Tring is out of all proportion to the current size of the town. Assuming the ONS figure of 2.4 persons per household, 2731 new houses would increase the population by over 6,500. This would increase the size of the town by over 50 per cent. It is almost the same as giving 'new town' status to Tring, changing the town completely and rendering all its infrastructure totally inadequate.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS1064
<b>Person ID</b>	1261678
<b>Full Name</b>	Gemma Rabbini
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please find below my strong objection (and attached PDF) for the proposal to develop hundreds of new homes on the approach to the town</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am saddened and upset that our Council, who as I understand it, are charged to ensure the town is protected and thrives, to protect the community and all the things that make this town special whilst also looking for opportunities to improve the area - should entertain and champion such a proposal.</li> <li>• This is a horrible assault on Green Belt land when we have very little remaining in the UK</li> <li>• The town is very overcrowded, and to add more traffic and more pedestrians into the town, I actually am very worried for the safety of those using the footpaths. We have so many young families and with the narrow footpaths and narrow road, I have seen a few near misses already. This proposal will only make this worse.</li> <li>• The local schools will be very oversubscribed and the quality of education may be at risk as a result from the extra children who will be attending schools in Tring.</li> <li>• With the Cala Home on Icknield Way struggling to sell, and the 300 extra families who will (but haven't yet moved in) and the strain this will put on the local area, surely this is enough extra strain on the town?!!!</li> </ul> <p>Why are you trying to ruin what makes Tring wonderful. I can't tell you how sad and frustrated this makes me. Please STOP this now. It's not a Strategy for Growth it is a Strategy for Destruction.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1085
<b>Person ID</b>	1261690
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Trevor Putman

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The choice of Option 1(c) and the consequent disproportionate massive increase in housing, population and pollution in Tring makes the Plan ill conceived and destructive of the natural environment notwithstanding “mitigating” measures. No such measures will help to “conserve, restore and enhance ..the landscape” (policy DM27) and in relation to TR02, 03 and the GUC, the proposals will not make a “positive contribution to the canalside environment” (policy DM49) but will damage it beyond recognition.</p> <p>Sites TR02 and 03 cover a wide expanse of open fields of Grade 2 quality soil, a patchwork of hedges and is bisected by Marshcroft Lane, a Roman road. This is truly a Lane or path to a Grade 2 listed bridge over the Grand Union Canal and onwards to the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Ridgeway National Trail. This lane/path is lined by a variety of mature trees, bushes, hedgerows and wild flowers. This area is renowned for its wildlife of all kinds and their habitats.</p> <p>This lane/path is widely used for leisure and wellbeing purposed by residents and visitors ie families, children going to School, dog walkers, ramblers, horseriders, joggers, cyclists – and more. It is a safe, social and healthy place to live in, use and enjoy.</p> <p>Under these Plans, this environment would be destroyed and replaced with 1400 houses set in a “new neighbourhood” to enhance the landscape! See DM27 above.</p> <p>The idea that Tring needs densely populated “new neighbourhoods” (ie Housing Estates) on a scale of 2200 houses and therefore 10,000 people (50% more than today) and 5000 cars to replace much loved and enjoyed Green Belt is beyond understanding. Tring does not need SANGs, new “open spaces” and “green corridors” in the area because it has natural features already! In effect, the Plan is to destroy them and try to substitute them!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS1087
<b>Person ID</b>	1261690
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Trevor Putman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Map included in the Supplementary information highlights where there is so much unused space and where the burden is most heavy. The Option needs to be revisited.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The plan needs much further consideration</li> <li>2 Tring proposals will be resolutely resisted in all reasonable ways by the vast majority of those who have made their home in a place they see as matching their country life choice; they do not want to see their lifestyle destroyed and will not allow it to happen</li> <li>3 The Council needs to think again and accept its responsibility to existing residents: not to do so would be a dereliction of duty</li> <li>4 The next consultation is awaited with interest in 2021</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1089
<b>Person ID</b>	1261693
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr James Hogarth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My overall objection is the effective destruction in character of the historic market town of Tring but proposing to effectively double the towns population. Centuries of organic growth will be replaced by the cohort of people looking to tick the boxes of the "current" governments directive.</p> <p>There are many Brown sites available for development across the UK, why are we encroaching upon this Green belt land and destroying AONB. A scandal.</p> <p>The infrastructure plans are not up to date and will cause chaos and misery as well as significantly adding to the local areas carbon footprint.</p> <p>With this past year of COVID no consideration has been given to the changing environment and the way in which we live our lives and work - people will be working from home more (without the need to be close to London), there will be less need for the high street retail expansion that has been planned. There are many Brown sites further away from London that would welcome the development and infrastructure - we in Tring do not.</p> <p>I would like to know how many members of the Decorum Local planning committee who have provisionally approved of these plans actually live in Tring?</p> <p>I myself have lived in Tring for over 50 years and am saddened to see the potential destruction of a beautiful market town with character, natural beauty and history.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1098
<b>Person ID</b>	1261700
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Yvonne Young
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed plan to increase Tring Housing by 55%.  
I am opposed to this for the following reasons:

- 1 The lack of infrastructure to support such an increase.
- 1 There is insufficient green belt land to support the current population, without taking a great proportion of the current green belt land for these new developments.
- 3.The current parking within the town is inadequate for the situation now , so taking the biggest car park in the town is ludicrous.
- 4.There are not enough shops to support this plan, which would mean new residents would go out of town to shop which would make a bad situation worse.

- 1 The lack of schools albeit the plan includes 2 new schools but the lack of school places now is more urgent.
- 1 The lack of doctors/ health service within the town. It is hard enough to get an appointment at present.

The town needs more affordable housing as people like my own children have had to move out of the area due to property being too expensive to get on the housing ladder.

More 1or 2 bed houses/ apartments are what is required. whether this be social housing, either housing association, part ownership or private ownership.

There is already enough large or family size accommodation in the town, especially with the present construction in progress.

For these reasons I strongly oppose the current proposals for Tring Town.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1137

**Person ID** 1261869

**Full Name** David Fowler

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We have received the Dacorum Local Plan 2020 to 2038 through our letter box. We live in Tring and I see 2731 houses are planned for Tring.</p> <p>Can you explain how the character of a small town like Tring can be maintained with such a large development. In addition are we as a country serious about the environment when the answer to our future requirements is to build more houses, roads, trainlines etc? The concept of the greenbelt appears no longer to exist, which is a real shame.</p> <p>I know as a council it is central government who is putting these housing targets on you, but cannot we push back and ask for more imaginative responses to our country's future needs?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1140
<b>Person ID</b>	1261339
<b>Full Name</b>	Keith Hughes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am opposed to the development of proposed site Tr01

It will destroy the beautiful landscape on the main entrance to the town, surrounded by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Irreparable harm would be done to the unique character of the historic market town – which must be preserved for current and future generations.

A new major road junction is proposed for the already totally unsuitable Cow Lane and at least two new major road junctions are proposed onto the London Road. These will cause serious environmental harm - congestion, noise, air pollution, etc - for all of Tring's residents, businesses and visitors.

These new access points are exclusively on the east and south of the proposed site, thereby limiting journey options and causing indirect journeys and congestion.

Tring is relatively traffic free - this is a much appreciated aspect of the town - and this would be lost forever if Tr01 is developed.

The public right of way across the farms is currently of enormous recreational benefit to numerous walkers {including many dog walkers}, joggers and families. If the farms are built upon, local residents in eastern Tring will be deprived of this much-loved amenity and their wellbeing will suffer.

There are no suitable local alternatives

The farms are a strong wildlife link between Tring Park and Pendley Manor and contain an important Local Wildlife Site. Conservation of our local wildlife heritage is of critical importance.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1247

**Person ID** 1259116

**Full Name** Tring in Transition (TinT)

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are concerned that many of the assumptions and conclusions reached from the Issues and Options (2017) version of the Local Plan are no longer relevant or optimal for what is now a much larger and very different development – in particular with regard to proposals for Tr06 and Tr01 which are fundamentally flawed in several respects.</li> <li>The proposals for Tr02 and Tr03 are excessive in scale for a development with a stated goal of being ‘compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character’ of a small market town. Considerations around supporting infrastructure (roads in particular) and mitigating Green Belt loss are insufficiently developed.</li> <li>NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces – there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key ‘honey pots’ of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.</li> <li>The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum requires developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and there is little to no evidence that this has been given meaningful consideration for Tring.</li> <li>Throughout the Plan there is confusion between what constitutes green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors and lack of explicit requirements around wildlife corridors, hedgerows and buffer zones (DBC Urban Nature Study maps; Tring. Herts Biological Records Centre 2005/6).</li> <li>The Plan must be more explicit on matters relating to Hertfordshire’s Sustainability Strategy and the priorities defined by the HCCSP – in particular, there is a clear opportunity to mandate the highest possible standards for renewable energy use, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity.</li> <li>There are too many caveats and vagueness of intent for a Plan proposing such significant impact on the character of the town and surroundings.</li> <li>There is an absence of even approximate timelines for the proposed developments, by site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Detailed responses:</b></p> <p><b>Section 23.139 ‘Introduction’ (Page 232)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that ‘growth will be sustainable transport / accessibility and infrastructure led’– we would agree with this sentiment; however, it is disappointing that the Infrastructure Plan was not ready for inclusion in the LP and we ask for a commitment on a date for its publication for public consultation.</li> </ul>



### Section 23.139 'Introduction' (Page 232)

- States '[growth will] *be chiefly brought forward as larger releases to help deliver [new infrastructure etc.]*'. Buried behind this statement are several assumptions and conclusions that appear not to have been made explicit in the Plan and have emerged, instead, only from consultation with local councillors.
- A worrying example of this is: '*we need more schooling and would rather have a new secondary school dedicated to Tring and therefore the associated developments must be large enough to contribute towards this.*'
- If this method of reasoning has driven the Plan then it should be made clear and explicit for public scrutiny and challenge. We would, therefore, seek assurances that all such cases are explicitly identified and highlighted.
- **The reverse logic underpinning the example above is fundamentally unacceptable. There should be no justification for increasing already excessive housing numbers in order to fund amenities that have themselves been necessitated by increased housing. In this case alternative schemes should be proposed (e.g., shared schools or the introduction of a Sixth Form College).**

### Section 23.143 'Tring Homes' (Page 234)

- A significant proportion of the future housing (around 2,200 dwellings) will be delivered as urban extensions through the release from the Green Belt of the following strategic sites: East of Tring (1,400 dwellings), New Mill (400 dwellings), Dunsley Farm (400 dwellings). However, densities on Tr01/Tr02/Tr03 are not stated despite seemingly being required by NPPF para 123b.

### Section 23.147 'Tring Homes – Key Objectives' (Page 234/5)

- As key objectives this list is very disappointing and sets the bar too low for what Tring deserves and for such a large-scale and impactful development on Green Belt land. It does little to build on the distinctiveness of Tring and it is not explicit enough about the importance of green/climate/environment issues. An opportunity to define a more aspirational goal for Tring in the mid-21st century has not been taken.
- Furthermore, it appears locked in an unimaginative chain of thinking: that in order to provide better facilities, strategic sites must be correspondingly on a very large scale. We would strongly argue that this is not the case.
- The flawed assumption about secondary school provision has already been highlighted above as an example. **The notion that the existing people of Tring will gain incrementally greater benefit from larger and larger developments is not justified in the Plan or any of the supporting evidence.**

Regarding specific bullet points:

- '*provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south*'. We are very concerned that this point confuses open, green and wildlife buffer spaces and/or This same confusion/obfuscation is repeated multiple times throughout the Plan. A green/open space or sports field is not wildlife space or corridor. There is a

need for all of these – but to meet NFFP requirements – ‘wildlife corridors’ need to be made explicit and mapped (NPPF para174), along with their linkage to existing wild/natural areas.

- *‘protect and enhance the existing wildlife site at Cow [Lane] Farm and/or provide for its translocation’*. **We strongly object to the optionality of ‘translocation’** – such an established site cannot be moved. The last six words need to be removed.
- *‘secure the delivery of a local north-south distributor road between Bulbourne Road and London Road’*. This is inconsistently referred to in the Plan (sometimes connecting only to Station Road – which is a very different scenario). The absence of any draft proposed routes, the apparent failure to take into account existing pinch points at Cow Lane, Station Road/London Road junction and the Bulbourne Road/Icknield Way junction, or to give consideration to the implications of bisecting Marshcroft Lance, and lack of mention/analysis of traffic from the north of Tring are a real concern. **NO plans for the development of Tr02/Tr03 should be approved until this point is resolved and subject to separate public consultation.**
- *‘include screen planting along London Road and ensure appropriate buffer / noise mitigation to the A41’*. We welcome screen planting – especially in conjunction with well-defined wildlife corridors and green/open spaces. Although we acknowledge separate jurisdiction, the opportunity should be taken to use low-noise surfaces on the A41 along the full length of Tring.

#### **Section 23.149 ‘Tring Employment’ (Page 235)**

- **The retention of ‘warehousing’ is strongly opposed.** No evidence base is provided to justify this and there is no evidence in the Plan of discussion with Aylesbury Vale District Council despite the availability of land for warehousing just 3 miles west of Tring on the A41 dual carriageway. Warehousing provides minimal jobs, is land hungry (thus removing land for other, preferable, use), is usually 24/7 and thus generates noise pollution, light pollution and vehicle emission pollution during unsocial hours/night-time. **Warehousing should be removed as an option and a modest maximum industrial building size established.**

#### **Section 23.149 ‘Tring Employment’ (Page 235)**

- Regarding Tr01, the proposal for some employment provision is supported, provided that this is only small units – noting that permission has been granted to extend larger industrial units at the west end of Tring by adding to the existing Icknield Road industrial area, which is adjacent to an interchange with the A41 dual carriageway. The proposed small units at Tr01 should be sufficiently flexible to be adaptable to use as ‘home working’ hubs, the demand for which is increasing, and which would support policy (climate change) by reducing the carbon footprint of commuting. Increasing working opportunity from base within the community could also lead to increased support/viability for local businesses.

#### **Section 23.149 ‘Tring Employment’ (Page 235)**

- The retention of Brook Street (Silk Mill) Business Park as employment is strongly supported, as provision of employment within the community/market town is a key factor in achieving sustainability.

#### **Section 23.149 ‘Tring Employment’ (Page 235)**

- Plans are focussed on the ‘release’ of Dunsley Farm. The assumptions associated with this were established in 2017 when the proposed development of Tring was much smaller and did not include the land close to Bullbourne –**these are no longer fully valid or appropriate**. Given that there is a garden centre, building supplies and other commercial operations already present at Bulbourne, consideration should be given to a modest expansion there, thus reducing the need to concentrate more traffic on a centre that will struggle to cope; this would also provide walking-distance employment for the north end of Tr03.

#### **Section 23.150 ‘Tring Retail’ (Page 235)**

- There is no mention of how the plan will explicitly support new forms of public transport. This omission should be addressed, not at a site level but for across Tring and the surrounding villages. Other Local Plans elsewhere in the UK have considered autonomous electric transport routes, for example – we’d like to see and would welcome more of the ambition seen in HCCSP transport priorities reflected here.

#### **Section 23.150 ‘Tring Retail’ (Page 235)**

- **We believe the assumptions underpinning this section are fundamentally flawed and the recommendations should be completely reconsidered.** We agree that there is limited call for traditional additional retail space; however, the other points appear rooted in ‘20th-century thinking’ and are not distinctive for Tring. The proposals for Tr06 do not take into account the revised large scale and location of housing now in the Plan.
- Traditional, food-oriented supermarket space on Tr06 no longer makes sense either in terms of scale or location (especially from an access and traffic standpoint). The alternative Tr01 proposal is also no longer appropriate – it is sub-optimal for developments in Tr02 and most of Tr03, inconveniently located and needlessly adding to traffic. We strongly recommend the entire proposal is reconsidered. Thought should be given to a site off Bulbourne Road, which would be more accessible from the proposed new developments, the north of Tring and the villages to the north of Tring.
- Consideration should also be given to the sort of scheme that has been successful elsewhere (e.g. Bicester) of relocating the existing (Tesco) supermarket to elsewhere on Tr01 and using that site for small business (instead of Tr01). Or as a residential home, given the projected large growth in the over-65 population.
- Regarding additional retail space in Tr06, Tring has a long history as a market town and significant success with the growth of the Farmers’ Market. Modern social trends point to a clear opportunity for a permanent, modern, ‘destination’ food and leisure facility (e.g., evidenced by Stroud or Rotherhithe). This could be made more accessible from the High Street by moving the entrance/exit of the Forge Car Park to Brook Street and using that space for retail development instead.

#### **Section 23.152 ‘Tring Movement’ (Page 235)**

- *‘With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street ... Tring does not suffer significant [traffic] problems’.* This statement is very misleading and disappointing. It is disappointing in so far as the only solution proposed in the plan to mitigate Brook Street congestion appears to be building a north–south link road which will

create the unintended consequence of becoming an unofficial 'East Tring bypass' and has challenging routing across the significant wildlife corridor of Marshcroft Lane.

We would recommend considering creative options to alleviate congestion on Brook Street. The statement is also misleading because there are pinch points which even with today's traffic levels lead to issues – and most of these are around the proposed Tr02/03 development – including Cow Lane, Station Road near the town centre and the bridges over the canal and railway. The Sustainable Transport Strategy does not appear to have projected the associated numbers and this must be a concern.

#### **Section 23.152 'Tring Movement' (Page 235)**

- The High Street is frequently congested with large tailbacks. Consideration should be given to partial or occasional pedestrianisation. Pedestrianising not only reduces car journeys, but also increases footfall, dwell time and ultimately retail spend for shops in places where it has been implemented sensibly (see <http://www.savills.co.uk/blog/article/207611/commercial-property/what-will-the-pedestrianisation-of-oxford-street-mean-for-retail.aspx>).

#### **Section 23.153 'Tring Movement' (Page 235)**

- This section states, *'The careful location of new development and promoting opportunities for sustainable travel, including improved cycle and pedestrian routes and bus services, will contribute in a significant way to making the town more accessible in ways that do not rely on motorised transport. It is important to minimise road going trips to limit congestion and promote walkable'* This further reinforces the case that it would be sensible to provide a supermarket at the Bulbourne end of Tr02 within walking distance of the new eastern development rather than having two supermarkets in close proximity (23.150) and likewise with regards to employment (23.148).

#### **Section 23.154 'Tring Movement' (Page 235)**

- This section notes an east–west cycleway linking to existing and proposed developments. We welcome this but are concerned that there is no joined-up route map available for public scrutiny. The Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Policy specifies a number of proposed cycle paths and notes the intention that 'it is important that new residents establish good habits when they move into Tring'. In effect this means such cycleways need to be at least laid out and preferably constructed **before** major development takes place.

#### **Section 23.156 'Tring Movement' (Page 235)**

- Cites the north–south link road between Bulbourne Road and Station Road which *'could help address congestion blackspots and improve traffic movements around Tring'*. This statement is inconsistent with 23.147. Such a link road would simply move congestion spots. This road has not been planned and the unintended consequences of its construction have not been reviewed, contra to NPPF para108c, or subjected to public scrutiny. Until that time assumptions should not be made about what it may achieve. Also see comment on section 23.147.

### **Section 23.158 ‘Tring Movement’ (Page 236)**

- States ‘*an assessment of parking demand and mitigation measures should accompany the development of Growth Area*’. We support this view, noting such assessments seem to be required by NPPF para108 to be within the LP, and also note that illicit parking within a kilometre of Tring Station is already an issue. New developments in Tr03 will become a magnet for parking on residential streets even if capacity is addressed (due to cost). It should not be beyond the scope of the Plan to make creative solutions a condition, in collaboration with Network Rail:
  - Designing new developments to support autonomous electric transport.
  - Ensuring that those sharing cars would get preferential parking and reduced rates.
  - Likewise, for those using electric vehicles.
- It is clear that new development in Tring will attract those wishing to commute into London. The Plan acknowledges capacity issue on the railways. An increase in the numbers, suggested by the Plan (even in a post-Covid economy) may tip the service over and have an adverse impact on those travelling and on the economy of the town. We would like to see agreed, joined-up plans to increase to capacity before new development on the scale planned goes ahead.

### **Policy SP23 – Delivering Growth in Tring (Pages 236-238)**

- Housing Delivery: States ‘*at least*’ 2731 dwellings. As noted elsewhere, even this number is untenable in the current Plan.
- There is no timescale given for any of the numbers (overall or by site), and yet these must exist as the overall growth for Dacorum is profiled by year. Why is this not stated as required by NPPF para73?
- Tr01 – To explicitly include residential accommodation for the elderly – given its close location to the town centre.
- Tr01 – Should state that any employment space is via small units or office space.
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include reference to a supermarket (as per comments above).
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include the replacement of the Local History Museum.
- Tr06 – Should NOT still be considering multi-level developments including retail, office and/or housing – it is not in keeping with Tring’s character, distracts from better use of the site and does not take into account the implications of Tr02/03 expansion.

### **Policy SP24 – Delivering Growth in East Tring (Pages 238-239)**

- Paragraph 5 states, ‘*promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy*’. Although well-intentioned, the walking element of this has the challenge of distance: the mid-section of Tr03 and Tr02 being 1 mile from Tring town centre, and the areas to the east of mid-point being a greater distance, thus above the 20-minute walking time for a fit person, and significantly beyond that for elderly people and parents with buggies/toddlers. This will inevitably lead to greater car dependency.

**Policy SP24 – Delivering Growth in East Tring (Pages 239) paragraph 6  
and Policy SP25 – Delivering Growth in South East Tring (Page 240) paragraph 6**

- The word ‘*exemplar*’ is used but not expanded upon. We welcome the word exemplar and set out below what this means in practice. There is a real opportunity – in keeping with Tring’s past as a local leader in wind and water energy – to make this a reality:
- Energy generation: the word ‘*exemplar*’ implies a really great example of what can be done. We would welcome an approach that seeks to deploy heat and power microgeneration technology to every building as a default position, and then removes those technologies/locations which may not be appropriate (for example solar PV on a north-facing roof). This would be the optimum way to achieve an ‘*exemplar*’.
- Mapping of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy is required by NPPF para151b. We would welcome a detailed approach for this in respect of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03.
  
- Ultimately, based on the energy hierarchy, it would be better to seek the highest possible performance of the building fabric (e.g., Passivhaus standard, energy-focused site design) and so have to incorporate fewer renewable generation technologies. Ideally both would be included within the exemplar, but if a choice has to be made, we recommend prioritising low-energy buildings over energy generation technologies.
  
- The ‘*exemplar*’ approach should be applied to all buildings and structures within the proposed development, including residential, commercial, retail, schools etc. Even car parking areas can benefit, for example from ‘solar carports’ which could also become charging hubs for eVs, electric bikes etc.
  
- If it is felt that the ‘*exemplar*’ level of deployment of renewable energy generation is too hard to achieve by commercial means (i.e. through encouraging developers), then consideration should be given to including a ‘permitted development’ approach at an early stage within the development whereby spaces (e.g. rooftops, land areas etc.) can be left available for the implementation of later community energy projects without planning constraints, as long as they fit the permitted development criteria. It will not be difficult to get the funding from the community for projects which directly benefit residents and businesses, and this will also foster a sense of ‘community ownership’.
  
- Another issue when looking at renewable energy generation and consumption within a contiguous area (e.g., housing estate, retail/commercial area) is the ability for excess electricity generation to be used locally/on site by other occupants. Currently this is difficult to achieve due to electricity distribution and licensing constraints, but a few schemes are emerging under the recently funded ‘local energy market trials’ (example: <https://project-leo.co.uk/about/the-leo-project/>, Cornish homes take part in trial to supply clean power to grid | Environment | The Guardian). This is already the norm in some European countries (e.g., Germany) and will likely take hold in the UK in the next 3-5 years in a meaningful way.

- For the new developments proposed, there is an opportunity to incorporate the necessary provisions (space, infrastructure) for creating a largely independent local renewable energy grid, which would allow the following principles to be implemented:
- Residents and businesses generate most of their electricity and heat needs on-premises.
- Excess (electricity) generation would be fed to a local/on-site energy storage scheme, available for consumption by other residents/businesses.
- If the total generation in the local grid exceeds the total consumption at a given time, the excess may either be stored or exported to the wider grid (in our area, UK Power Networks at present).
- If the total consumption in the local grid exceeds the total generation plus the energy which can be delivered from the energy storage system, additional power is drawn centrally from the wider grid.
- Depending on the technology deployed, the electrical energy requirements and the timeframe, there may or may not still be the need for an 'emergency' direct feed from the individual premises to the wider grid. 'Emergency heat' would come from an electric heat pump or similar on-premises provision.
- This would enable the newly developed areas to run almost fully on renewably generated heat and electricity, increasing resilience, minimising CO2 emissions, and promoting conscious use of valuable resources. A complementary factor would be having low-energy buildings in the first instance.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1271

**Person ID** 1261930

**Full Name** Chris Gee

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring sits as an outlier in Dacorum and is sited close to Aylesbury which is presently undergoing massive development in housing. Given the close proximity of new houses being located in the south, west and north of Aylesbury, it seems the proposal for 2200 new properties in Tring is very excessive. What local co-operation has taken place with Aylesbury Vale DC and their development plans? Have the two plans been considered together? If Aylesbury is already being developed (c7000 homes in the Berryfields area, plus potentially many earmarked for the west of Aylesbury up to the new HS2 corridor) why is there a need for 2200 new dwellings just 5-7 miles away, attached to the small historic market town of Tring? Is there not an opportunity for better integration and regional development, rather than a borough-by-borough approach, that fails to take into account the cultural heritage of the existing town?</p> <p>An additional opportunity exists to look at citing the new properties in the Pitstone development plan, rather than take greenfield developments to the East of Tring. Pitstone quarry as a former brownfield site is just the other side of the West Coast Mainline and is an undeveloped brownfield site that could easily accommodate significant new housing demand, thus protecting the environmental heritage of the lands to the east of Tring. The undeveloped brownfield land at Pitstone has easy links to Tring Station, to the local landscape (canal, reservoirs, Chiltern hills, etc) and at present is visually already an impact. Is there not opportunity to trade or offset this local development with the local authority responsible for this area, giving a more sympathetic regional development?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1375
<b>Person ID</b>	1144662
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Ward
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>These comments are in relation to the proposals at Tring.</p> <p>The number of houses proposed to be built at the Station end of Tring Station are being built on a Green Belt flood plain (in particular near Ivy Cottage and along the expanse of field running alongside the Canal), they are obscuring the view across to AONB and the Ivinghoe Beacon for properties along Marshcroft Lane, Station Road and the approach view along Station Road.</p>



The houses to be built are in a large number disproportionate to the local community and feel of an ancient Chilterns Market Town.

The provisions and amenities are not available to support such numbers of houses. The Station is already full in peak hours with cars and people, expanding the station will be unsightly and unacceptable alongside AONB of Ashridge and the Ridgeway, the infrastructure for transport is not there. Neither is drainage, schools, doctors or other amenities. Adding amenities specifically for the new build area will disconnect the new build area further from the existing town and likely cause a problematic and fragmented community.

The fields proposed are some of the only green spaces available to local families and children, they are currently used by a large proportion of the community for recreational activity along the footpaths and removing that provision will lead to a significant change in the way people, in particular young people from the centre of town are able to enjoy their leisure time.

True, there is a need for new affordable homes, but the number that have been proposed is unacceptable. Especially given we have already had a large Tring expansion at the Longfield Road end of Tring. The number of houses proposed needs to be reduced. Tring and Tring Station (Pendley Village) are a Town and a Hamlet, separate thriving communities, and should not be merged together by a disproportionate new build town of unaffordable and unsupported houses, without due consideration for all of these points above.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1387

**Person ID** 1262052

**Full Name** Ms Severine Robitaille

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My objections are on several grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neither Berkhamsted nor Tring could cope with such a large increase in population. In the case of Tring doubling the size seems a ludicrous idea</li> <li>- The loss of character of both towns; people live here for its countryside green appeal, which would be highly impacted. This will decrease value of these towns significantly</li> <li>- There would be a strong ecological impact with water not draining properly through existing fields and creating flooding</li> <li>- The infrastructure of the towns could not accommodate it: the roads are already congested with high pollution levels</li> <li>- There is no talk of increase of public transport and cycle ways</li> <li>- What would be put in place to replace the loss of green land?</li> <li>- It currently takes 2 weeks to get a gp appointment, we would need to employ new doctors; there is no serious proposal for this</li> <li>- It is going against government policy and building on Greenbelt; as you are required too, you should look at brownfield sites first</li> <li>- The level of new cars would bring a rise in pollution levels and the destruction of the green barrier between A41 and Berkhamsted town would have a high impact on Air Quality. It would also be quite unpleasant to live there</li> </ul> <p>In short I object on ecological grounds as destruction of natural habitat, large increase in pollution levels, destruction of town character. I believe that option of brownfield sites should be looked at primarily and a smaller scale plan considered.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1408
<b>Person ID</b>	1262065
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr George Goldhagen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Have you coordinated your development plans with those of Bucks CC? The whole A41 is being developed at an alarming rate without apparent oversight.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1547
<b>Person ID</b>	1261408
<b>Full Name</b>	juanita mann
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed 55% expansion of Tring is utterly disproportional. It will completely overwhelm the existing market town and destroy its character.</p> <p>The proposed extension to the East of the town is particularly inappropriate. It will create significant urban sprawl, swamp the hamlet of Tring station, encroach significantly into the countryside, remove a large part of the buffer between Tring and the Chilterns / Grand Union canal (AONB) and adversely impact the character and charm of Tring itself. AND it is on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Tring station car park is already at capacity. The local road system of twisty lanes, small villages and hamlets cannot cope with the influx proposed and in many places safety would be seriously compromised.</p> <p>Tring itself has a narrow high street which struggles to accommodate vehicles passing each other. The cross roads at Akeman Street is a particular bottleneck</p> <p>The Ashridge estate and surrounding area currently welcomes a large number of visitors (most of whom arrive by car) with footfall and parking already an issue for both the Ashridge and the surrounding area.</p> <p>To propose building 1400 dwellings on the East of Tring site and then suggest that there will be "significant green infrastructure provision....in the form of open spaces" is completely contradictory and frankly insulting.</p> <p>The proposed development of Tring would neither enhance nor protect the "distinctive landscape character". It would overwhelm the small town of Tring and its surrounding villages</p> <p>Why is Tring being asked to shoulder such a large and disproportional development, well above anything being proposed for even the 20 most populated urban centres in England?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1590
<b>Person ID</b>	1149465
<b>Full Name</b>	David Reavell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to the developments proposed for sites Tr01 and Tr 03.</p> <p>Since the draft plan was prepared new central government guidance on housing need and national housing policy has emerged. The plan should be revised to take latest housing demand numbers into account.</p> <p>This review should also reflect a shift of proposed supply from the south of England towards the North and Midlands. this review should result in a reduction of the supply required in Dacorum through the plan period.</p> <p>The housing policy should be revisited to rebalance the housing requirement through the borough as the current proposals are over reliant on delivery in Tring and under reliant on capacity in Berkhamsted and Kings Langley.</p> <p>Existing facilities in Tring are overstretched there is a substantial development taking place at Roman Park Tring which will be ongoing for several years of the local plan. If the proposed allocations at Tr01/Tr02/Tr03 were confirmed, Tring will effectively be surrounded by new housing developments resulting in huge strain on facilities and access.</p> <p>It is also unreasonable to expect this amount of development to be absorbed in a reasonable time frame and therefore there would be significant risk that the planned delivery is unachievable.</p> <p>Alternative more sustainable and deliverable sites such as the proposed but unallocated site known as Bulbourne Cross on the Eastern edge of Berkhamsted should be allocated in place of some of the proposed Tring allocations. This offers a comprehensive and balanced development which would enhance the facilities and attractiveness of Berkhamsted without overwhelming the town. In contrast the proposed developments at Tring would fundamentally change the towns character and cause many harmful impacts without any major additional facilities being provided with only replacement of existing ones being proposed there is no true enhancement being offered to the town..</p> <p>Tring delivery should be sized relative to its capacity to absorb it without a fundamental change in character. This would be achieved by delivery of Roman Park , Tr02 and a small allocation (c400units) within proposal Tr03 northern edge.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1606
<b>Person ID</b>	1261385
<b>Full Name</b>	stephen hearn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Growth area TR06 – off Brook Street Tring</b></p> <p>TR06 comprises Tring Market Auctions, The Tring Local History Museum, the Fire Station and Forge Car Park.</p> <p><b>Tring Market Auctions</b> is located at the rear of the site of TR06 with access from Brook Street and a license to access the Forge Car Park.</p> <p>The ownership of the site is divided between Tring Town Council (Auction Rooms, Museum and the Market Place <i>hardstanding area</i>), Dacorum Borough Council (Forge Car Park) and Herts County Council (The Fire Station). The Freehold ownerships make it a somewhat complicated issue should planning proceed.</p> <p>In the proposal, no mention has been made for Tring Market Auctions to be included in the future plans of TR06, but mention has been made that if the site is re-developed Tring Market Auctions would be offered an alternative site in the town – where? The Auctions currently comprise about 16000 sq ft of buildings alone together with the adjoining parking areas. No detail has been provided and no mention of re-location provisions has been made. It appears the proposals are an afterthought to the Dacorum local plan. Tring Market Auctions occupy under the terms of a lease with Tring Town Council.</p> <p><u>The History and Current use of the Site</u></p> <p>In 1893 under the requirements of the Board of Agriculture and with the assistance of Lord Rothschild, the sale room with office was constructed in Brook Street. It was let to W Brown &amp; Co. who conducted the first sale by auction in January 1894, since when auctions and sales have been held continually on the site for over 125 years – surely this qualifies the location to be part of Tring’s heritage.</p> <p>During recent years from 1960 there has been numerous enquiries and planning applications to develop the site with offices and supermarkets together with residential, all of which have been rejected.</p>

In 1993 the livestock auction ceased to operate leaving the chattel auction business to continue and flourish under the directorship of Stephen Hearn who took Tring Market Auctions to become independent and grow into the fine company it is today.

It now has an extensive complex of four Auction Rooms, forming one of the largest and best known venues of its type in the Home Counties.

The sales attract a very large number of vendors and buyers from Tring and the surrounding towns and villages together with an ever-growing number of people from throughout the Home Counties and Internationally. Many of the buyers represent the trade and other specialist collectors in all categories.

The auctions provide a friendly and entertaining atmosphere on sale days making it an enjoyable venue for both business and pleasure. Regularly around 500 visitors attend on viewing and sale days, many of these attending the auction visit the town shops and local attractions.

Tring Market Auctions is a unique and key component of the town's economic town centre fabric. It provides a key fulcrum for maintaining the town centre economic sustainability. Visitors to the auctions provide business for other local shops and enterprises not just on sale days but across all the sites activities, its town centre location is fundamentally linked to many other local business and the town market continued sustainability.

The auction rooms provide a unique component part of maintaining Tring Town Centres' viability and supporting Tring based economic development. If Tring is expected to grow then business, jobs and economic infrastructure growth needs to be matched, Tring Market Auctions needs to be maintained as it supports this economic ambition of the Local Plan through continued town centre provision of a business that is complementary to local shops and does not provide competition, as would the proposed supermarket.

The Saleroom operates with a permanent staff of some 20 people which includes consultants and additional part time staff during sale days. The venue is a key local employer, bringing training and development and job opportunities for local young people.

The Auction sales deal with all periods of furnishings and collectables, processing over 50,000 lots each year providing an effective and affordable house furnishing option for many local people. It has a growing importance as a recycling centre, particularly when it is estimated over 20 tonnes of furniture timber is recycled every fortnight, which supports the climate ambitions in the Local Plan.

In addition the Auction provides a key income stream to the Town Council reducing precept impact on local residents and contributing to a sustainable model of local government

The Auction provides a service to both the local community and professional organisations throughout the Home Counties and beyond.

#### Points of Consideration

- It is positioned on a site with a long history of auctions and marketing of stock
- It is an important asset for the Town
- The auction attracts a large number of visitors to Tring throughout the year

- It employs local townspeople
- Town Centres should reflect the distinctive characteristics of a Market Town
- The site would not lend itself as a supermarket, particularly when this proposal is unproven
- The Auction Rooms occupy a strategic position at the head of an open space and wildlife corridor which runs from the Tring Park Mansion vista through to Icknield It is very much part of the local community, supporting many of the Town's organisations and groups

Planning Matters for Consideration

- Brook Street has a notorious reputation for being dangerous in parts where it is very narrow making it often difficult for vehicles to pass
- Tring High Street has introduced traffic calming measures
- It is suggested in the development plan that a supermarket would be served with a new carpark. Bearing in mind the development would include the existing Forge Car Park, does one interpret this as denying the town parking facilities
- Recently, two large planning applications have been refused in Brook Street both in close proximity to TR06, one being the residential re-development of Market Garage and the introduction of a residential development on the North Eastern side of Silk Mill works. In both instances, the reason for refusal included over-development of the respective sites and the dangers of access to Brook Street
- The plan proposals to create new food and drink leisure uses is difficult to understand when there are currently so many retail outlets available in Tring
- It states that any re-development of the site would only be permitted once replacement facilities are provided elsewhere in the town. The only specified new location is in Growth Area TR01 (Dunsley Farm) for the Fire and Rescue There is no detail with regard to the siting of Tring Market Auctions, nor the Local History Museum.
- One can create new buildings but one cannot create history

TR06 is not a redundant site, it forms and important part of Tring Town Centre with Tring Market Auctions and the local Museum providing both business and pleasure to hundreds of people throughout the year.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1620

**Person ID** 1262293

**Full Name** David Cave

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Tring Delivery Strategy should include an infrastructure phasing plan across the whole of Tring, rather than on site specific infrastructure. For instance the strategy talks of local highway improvements, however it is important to consider the wider impact on the highways network particularly on key routes to the A41 such as Icknield Way.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to a centralised infrastructure delivery organisation not controlled by housing developers that delivers infrastructure in advance of the housing development using developer contributions.</p> <p>Whilst the climate emergency is a core theme of the draft local plan there is little reference in the delivery strategy for Tring. New developments should be carbon net zero and put the protection and enhancement of biodiversity as the core objective with the number of houses to be accommodated by any particular development site only agreed once the core objective is delivered.</p> <p>This scale of development in Tring is a unique opportunity that should not be wasted. The strong housing market and greenfield nature of the proposed sites means the land is of very high value. It is important that the Council recognises this and maintains high levels of infrastructure investment, strong design codes and holds developers to account to deliver exemplar community investment in the widest possible sense including for local clubs, creating and enhancing a prosperous high street ravaged by COVID 19 etc</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1652
<b>Person ID</b>	1262236
<b>Full Name</b>	Kevin Tozer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes



**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Tring: Tring sits on the edge of Dacorum and a short distance from Aylesbury which is presently undergoing increased housing development. What local co-operation has taken place with Aylesbury Vale DC and Dacorum with regards to Housing development plans?

In the areas in Buckinghamshire which adjoin Dacorum in particular between Tring and Aylesbury and Tring and Pitstone, there looks to be stretches of land which aren't Greenbelt areas and which have new infrastructure which would be more suitable for development.. The quarry on the edge of Tring which is a huge safety issue for the Police during summer months (due to the illegal use of the land typically from swimmers) hasn't been considered for these developments. This may be due to this just being in Buckinghamshire however must be considered so as to save Greenbelt areas and the overcrowding within Tring.

The proposal admits that the development areas in Tring particularly in East Tring will be sensitive. It should also consider:

- 1 The development area and Station Road is often flooded and therefore not suitable for housing. If developed, where would all this water run off to? This hasn't been considered in the developments.
- 2 Tourism - Tring attracts many visitors often on a day trip and usually from London. They come to see and experience the beautiful countryside , quaint market town, and different pace of life to that in the city. By developing Tring from something which is unique and a worthy destination for visitors to something which is over developed will reduce the attraction for tourists. Other train station stops further up the line from Tring will now become more attractive to those who want to experience a day in the countryside.
- 3 The plans aren't clear as to the impact on Grove Road in Tring or on Station Road during the build works or after.
- 4 From a Grove Road perspective this requires serious consideration due to the Primary school and the increased dangers to the Children attending.
- 5 Station Road in Tring is a main artery to the station. The plans haven't considered the impact on the flow of traffic during or after the proposed development. It also hasn't considered any impact on the capacity of the train network.
- 6 Pre pandemic, the trains from Tring to Euston were over crowded with seats not being available typically from Hemel Hempstead for peak morning and evening trains. The strategy doesn't consider any impact on the well being and/or safety of individuals due to any increasing demand on the rail network.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1686

**Person ID** 1165136

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs J.D Battye

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Any plan to increase the provision of new homes in Tring and Berkhamsted to anything more than a modest degree risks totally negating the idea of “developments acknowledging local character.” Unlike Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring are in need of conservation not regeneration and it is in any event totally questionable whether market forces will allow them to contribute as substantially to the object of the whole exercise-affordable homes.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1705
<b>Person ID</b>	1262353
<b>Full Name</b>	L HOUSDEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	See attached representations - it is TTC's view that the overall strategy of directing so much growth to Tring is flawed - see in particular the representations upon draft Policies SP23, SP24 & SP25
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Tring Town Council - Completed consultation Comments Form (Final).pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1708
<b>Person ID</b>	1149470
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Fiona Reavell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to the developments proposed for sites Tr01 and Tr 03.</p> <p>Since the draft plan was prepared new central government guidance on housing need and national housing policy has emerged. The plan should be revised to take latest housing demand numbers into account.</p> <p>This review should also reflect a shift of proposed supply from the south of England towards the North and Midlands. this review should result in a reduction of the supply required in Dacorum through the plan period.</p> <p>The housing policy should be revisited to rebalance the housing requirement through the borough as the current proposals are over reliant on delivery in Tring and under reliant on capacity in Berkhamsted and Kings Langley.</p> <p>Existing facilities in Tring are overstretched there is a substantial development taking place at Roman Park Tring which will be ongoing for several years of the local plan. If the proposed allocations at Tr01/Tr02/Tr03 were confirmed, Tring will effectively be surrounded by new housing developments resulting in huge strain on facilities and access.</p> <p>It is also unreasonable to expect this amount of development to be absorbed in a reasonable time frame and therefore there would be significant risk that the planned delivery is unachievable.</p> <p>Alternative more sustainable and deliverable sites such as the proposed but unallocated site known as Bulbourne Cross on the Eastern edge of Berkhamsted should be allocated in place of some of the proposed Tring allocations. This offers a comprehensive and balanced development which would enhance the facilities and attractiveness of Berkhamsted without overwhelming the town. In contrast the proposed developments at Tring would fundamentally change the town's character and cause many harmful impacts without any major additional facilities being provided with only replacement of existing ones being proposed there is no true enhancement being offered to the town.</p> <p>Tring delivery should be sized relative to its capacity to absorb it without a fundamental change in character. This would be achieved by delivery of Roman Park , Tr02 and a small allocation (c400units) within proposal Tr03 northern edge.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1737

<b>Person ID</b>	1262353
<b>Full Name</b>	L HOUSDEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We have reviewed the draft Emerging Strategy document which is now out for consultation and, in short, are very concerned at the level of growth (particularly the quantity of housing) that the emerging Plan is expecting Tring to accommodate. The Emerging Strategy (see draft Policy SP2) proposes at least 16,596 new houses within the Borough, of which 2,700 (some 16%) are to be directed to Tring. The origin of the 16% figure is unclear, but it is a considerable increase upon the 4% which were directed to Tring within the Core Strategy. The Borough's <i>"Settlement Hierarchy"</i> (draft Policy SP3) is otherwise unchanged and in the case of many of the other settlements in the Borough, the percentage of the overall housing allocation are little changed, or even reduced, from those in the Core Strategy. Tring's growth is to be met mostly via a number of large site allocations upon what is currently Green Belt, adjoining the boundary of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CAONB). Two areas of Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are just outside the Town and the Town Centre itself is a Conservation Area. It is TTC's view that other, less sensitive, locations in the Borough ought to be considered much more thoroughly as destinations for growth before allocating such major development towards Tring. Many other locations in the Borough are equally accessible (say Kings Langley, which has a rail station and is much closer to the M25), but although may also be within the Green Belt, they are not close to the CAONB and so not such sensitive locations in relation to landscape impact.</p> <p>2.2. According to the 'Settlement Hierarchy Study' of October 2017 (see paragraph 3.4.7) which is included as part of the current emerging plan's Evidence Base:</p> <p>"Tring sits below the two preceding towns in terms of scale. It is a compact town surrounded by the Green Belt with the CAONB running east-west along its southern fringes and northern tip. The level and range of services and facilities to be found in the town is much more modest, but it does include a supermarket and secondary school. It has a built-up historic core encompassing the town centre. Employment opportunities are much more dispersed across the settlement, although the main focus is on Icknield Way. Tring is unusual in that the train station serving the town is located outside of its boundary(*). The town is set to grow modestly on its western edge through Local Allocation LA5 (up to 200 homes)". [<b>* Our highlighting - It is nearly 3kms from the Town Centre to the Station</b>].</p> <p>2.3.</p>

The accompanying 'Settlement Profiles Paper' (also within the emerging plan's Evidence Base) put the 2011 population of the Town at 11,713 (which itself was a 'modest' 0.7% increase since the 2001 Census population of 11,635) living within 4,829 households. This gave an average household size in 2011 of some 2.43. The combination of 'Known Commitments' (313 dwellings), 'Local Plan Strategic Allocations' (2,274 dwellings) and some 144 new dwellings on 'Windfall sites' means that there will be an addition of some 2,700 households to the Town, representing an increase by 2038 of nearly 56% and a population increase of something in the region of 6,500 people. This will inevitably lead to a considerable increase in car-borne traffic.

2.4. Also, within the Evidence Base for the Emerging Plan is a 'Topic Paper' in respect of 'The Chilterns Beechwoods SAC'. In its 'Introduction', this document makes the point that *"the need for homes, employment land and associated infrastructure is much higher than faced by previous Plans yet this has to be planned for in the context of the same extensive planning and environmental constraints"* (SAC Topic Paper, paragraph 1.1). Paragraph 4.4 of this Topic Paper says that *"Natural England have advised the Council that the key issues that the HRA [Habitats Regulations Assessment] will likely need to address include recreational pressure and air quality pressures at the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC"*. However, the SAC Topic Paper has already made it clear (at paragraph 1.3) that the process of HRA and Appropriate Assessment necessary to inform the final version of the Local Plan has yet to be undertaken. Consultants are still to be appointed to undertake this exercise and *"no HRA documents are published alongside the draft Local Plan for consultation"*. The outcomes of this exercise are therefore unknown. Issues such as air quality and recreational impact have been highly relevant to the delivery of new housing close to SACs elsewhere (see for instance at Epping Forest where this issue has persisted since 2018). The matter should certainly be fully considered prior to determining a Local Plan strategy that directs 16% of its new housing to Tring, increasing the number of its households by over 55%.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Tring Town Council - Completed consultation Comments Form (Final).pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1762
<b>Person ID</b>	1262353
<b>Full Name</b>	L HOUSDEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

**Tring Delivery Strategy  
comment**

4.19. According to paragraphs 7-9 of the NPPF *“the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.... [and]... the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways”* . It must also be remembered that the *“presumption in favour of sustainable development”* does not apply in every case, and, amongst the exceptions are, where the land in question is Green Belt, AONB, SAC, or subject to heritage designation (NPPF, paragraph 11 - Footnote 6, as well as paragraphs 170-177 & 194).

15/cont

4.20. Paragraphs 31 & 32 of the NPPF require that *“the preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.... [and]... Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements .....[demonstrating]...how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains).* Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued”.

4.21. It is a statutory requirement of the AONB designation for an LPA *“to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area ”*, and the choice of development sites (and the delineation of their boundaries), has been done purely by reference to avoiding the landscape designation, rather than concern for the impact on setting. In addition, the assessment of possible impacts upon the nearby SAC from the level of proposed growth ascribed to Tring has not been done. As a result, the current Strategy would certainly fail the NPPF’s ‘environmental objective’ and probably also the ‘social objective’ by failing to consider the impact of promoting such a major change in the population level of the Town. The proposed strategy of devolving some 16% of the Borough’s new housing to Tring seems to be based upon the findings of the ‘Settlement Hierarchy Study’ concerning the Town’s good transport links. However, as we pointed out above, that document notes the considerable distance of the railway station from the Town Centre. The distance between the station and the location of the major allocations would also militate against users from walking, so much of the 55% population increase would be likely to be making use of private cars for most trips.

4.22. Another failing of the Evidence Base appears at paragraph 21.18 (which leads into draft Policy DM50 *“Transport and Movement”*) where the comment is made that: *“We are continuing to develop the transport proposals that will be included within the Plan. These are being informed by detailed County-wide COMET transport modelling to identify pressure points across the network in addition to the detailed Sustainable Transport Strategies that have been prepared for Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring which set out detailed proposals for transport interventions. These will be developed with the County Council and other relevant bodies and fed into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and into site specific policies for development. The exact transport interventions and the timing of delivery will be detailed in the next stage of the Plan ”*.

4.23. This again shows the lack of assessment into the traffic levels already existing in the Town and how these are likely to change with the significant population increases proposed.

4.24. The *“fundamental aim”* of Green Belt is to *prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open”*

(NPPF, paragraph 133) and paragraph 134 continues “*Green Belt serves five purposes*” (which among other things include ‘checking unrestricted sprawl’ and “*safeguarding the countryside from encroachment*”). Paragraph 123 of the NPPF warns that, in cases “*where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site*”

The very low densities proposed in the emerging plan are inefficient and so require the release of considerable quantities of Green Belt land from places such as the outer edge of Tring, increasing sprawl and subsuming settlements that currently have a separate identity (such as Bulbourne and the area around the Station). Before considering development in the Green Belt LPAs should firstly assess all other options, including making better use of existing urban land (see NPPF such as paragraph 137).

4.25. Overall, from reading the first two Green Belt assessments (Parts 1 & 2), one can only conclude that all of the land identified for release in the latest draft Plan’s major allocations for Tring (sites TR01, TR02 & TR03) is considered to be performing an important Green Belt role. Whereas, partial amendments to the Green Belt boundary in respect of both TR01 & TR02 might be made without compromise to wider objectives (they could not in respect of Tr03 at all), this is the not the same as allocating the entirety of both ‘sub-areas’ for major built development. There is also little evidence that DBC has looked more widely to meet its housing commitments upon less sensitive land. We mentioned above the possibility of considering Green Belt releases around Kings Langley and in view of recent problems on the ‘high street’, the option of the possible repurposing of retail sites within Hemel Hempstead Town Centre must now also be robustly assessed.

4.26. The suitability of the largest three allocated sites in Tring is also questionable in respect of a number of other elements of Government policy. The NPPF advises that where agricultural land is to be taken for major development, the use of land of poorer quality is preferred (see NPPF, paragraph 171). However, most of the land being allocated under Tr02 & Tr03 is Grade 2 agricultural land (defined in the NPPF’s ‘Glossary’ and paragraph 170 as being the ‘Best and Most Versatile’).

Furthermore, there are known archaeological deposits upon the southern element of Tr03 and the NPPF warns that, because heritage assets are “*irreplaceable*”, there must be “*clear and convincing justification*” for any harm or loss of significance.

----

17/cont

4.27. Currently, it is not clear whether any detailed archaeological assessment of this allocation has been carried out, but in cases where the development involves destruction of assets of the “highest significance” (which can include non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest) the required justification “*should be wholly exceptional*” (see NPPF, paragraph 194).

4.28. The potential benefit to the vitality from the promotion of residential development into the Town Centre is insufficiently recognised (see for instance NPPF paragraph 85) within the emerging plan’s Policy SP6. None of the Town Centre

allocations envisage residential-led development within the list of appropriate uses. Site Tr06 is also a sensitive site in heritage terms, with the Tring Local History museum located there. It may not easily lend itself to development as a supermarket, which to meet operator requirements needs a functional building. More work needs to be done upon this site as it is in multiple ownership (TTC, Dacorum Borough and the County Council) and thought must also be given to the impact of any relocation of the Auction Rooms upon the rest of the Town Centre (the operation brings in a great many visitors as well as provides employment). The proposal for a new convenience goods store at the Dunsley Farm Growth Area (Growth Area Tr01) may not meet with the terms of the sequential test in that it is not well connected to public transport or to the rest of the Town Centre.

#### Concluding Remarks

5.1. To be found "*sound*" the emerging Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires plans are 'Positively prepared'; 'Justified' (i.e. based on evidence); 'Effective'; and 'Consistent with national policy' (i.e. prepared in accordance with the policies in the NPPF). As currently proposed, the Emerging Strategy's allocations around Tring will be none of those things.

5.2. Some key evidence is not yet available, for instance, that in relation to the impact upon the Beechwoods SAC or the traffic information and in other respects the evidence from assessment has been ignored (such as the clear advice in the 2016 Arup Report not to proceed with what is now allocation Tr03).

Two independent assessments of these overall land 'parcels' and sub-areas have found that they are performing a significant Green Belt role and although the Green Belt might be amended in relation to small parts of the land, there is no evidence, which would support their wholesale release.

It is TTC's firm view that other development alternatives in the Borough have not been adequately assessed.

--

18/cont

5.3. Furthermore, the evidence for the derivation of the 16% share of the total new households over the plan period is not made available either and insufficient thought has been given to the social impact of a Strategy which will lead to the population of the Town rising by 55% in less than 18 years.

5.4. Aside from Green Belt restrictions, there are other limitations upon the development of these allocated land parcels, such as impact upon the setting of the adjacent nationally important CAONB, archaeological constraints and considerable losses of high quality agricultural land. As an aside, the intended development densities put forward in the Emerging Strategy would suggest a profligate use of land.

5.5. The bar in respect of Green Belt release tends to be set quite high by Inspectors, see for instance the situation with St Albans' latest emerging plan. As you may be aware, in that case, the Inspectors halted the Public Examination and then informed the authority that the plan was likely to be found 'unsound'. Amongst the various reasons given, was the emerging Plan's over-reliance on a few very large strategic Green Belt allocations, rather than focussing upon more, smaller, releases. To be successful with large scale releases in front of an Inspector it has to be shown that there are



'exceptional circumstances' applying and then, that all means of meeting that requirement have been properly explored, **before** resorting to taking land out of the Green Belt.

5.6. We trust that the above comments will be viewed as helpful and that the next phase of the Emerging Strategy will address these various lacunae before being set in front of the Secretary of State.

**Included files** [Tring Town Council - Completed consultation Comments Form \(Final\).pdf](#)

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1794

**Person ID** 1262386

**Full Name** MR PETER MARTIN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I'm objecting to the amount of housing proposed for the Tring and Berkhamsted areas, it is a ridiculous amount to add on to our lovely town, my main concerns are our beautiful land will disappear for good, it will affect the wildlife which is already disappearing fast! more housing will mean more vehicles, more pollution, more crime, a picturesque market town like these should be left alone and not be allowed to be built on green belt land anyway, please reconsider, thank you

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1851

**Person ID** 1262475

**Full Name** Mrs Jane Wilde

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly oppose Dacorum's plans for new housing in Tring, which will amount to a totally disproportionate addition to the town's housing stock – in the region of 55% more houses!</p> <p>This will totally change the nature of the town, put huge pressure on local service and Infrastructure and increase traffic massively.</p> <p>It will also be an unacceptable incursion into precious Green Belt land.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1876
<b>Person ID</b>	1160632
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Foster and Monique Bos
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	928570
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr James Holmes
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Associate Director Aitchison Raffety Ltd
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We object to the amount of development proposed to be allocated to Tring, which is disproportionate to the size of the settlement. Tring has a population of only around 11,730, whereas Berkhamsted is significantly <u>larger</u> with a population of around 18,500. Berkhamsted has a much larger range of shops and services than Tring and is better able to accommodate a higher proportion of the housing growth.</p> <p>However, the emerging Local Plan proposes to allocate sites for 1,870 homes in Berkhamsted and some 2,200 homes in Tring. This is not justified as it will deprive Berkhamsted of the homes that it needs whilst placing undue pressure on Tring which is a much smaller settlement and is less able to cope with the additional housing.</p>

The imbalance in the proposed housing allocation between these two settlements is illustrated in the table below. It shows that the consultation document seeks to allocate an additional 291 homes to Tring which should be allocated to Berkhamsted to ensure a fair distribution of growth.

**Tring**

**Berkhamsted**

**Total**

Population

11,730

38.8%

18,500

61.2%

30,230

100%

Housing growth proposed by current  
consultation

1,870

45.9%

2,200

54.1%

4,070

100%

If housing is allocated on basis of  
settlement size

1579

38.8%

2491

61.2%

4,070

100%

**Difference in homes**

**+ 291**

**(-291)**

-

Furthermore, Table 2 'Sources of Housing Land Supply' in the consultation document shows that the Council is planning to provide some 303 more homes than it actually needs across the Borough. The table clearly shows this as a surplus over the required housing need figure.

If the excess homes being planned for in the consultation document (303) are added to the excess figure for Tring as set out above (291) this amounts to some 594 homes. This exceeds the proposed allocation for 400 homes on the Dunsley Farm site Tr01.

There can be no justification in allocating more sites that are actually needed or proportionally more homes for Tring, as to do so means that it is accommodating housing that should be provided in other settlements.

The consultation document proposes an unprecedented level of housing growth which the relatively small market town of Tring is not able to sustain. We urge the Council to take into consideration the following points:-

- Traffic into Tring in rush hours at the start and end of week days and at the weekend is bad already and is often at a standstill around the High Street. The High Street generally is unsuitable for more vehicles as it is too narrow and already is blocked when buses have to pass there. More buses and cars would add to the existing congestion and highway safety problems that currently
- Additionally, the car parks in and around the town, and particularly on the High Street, are over full already generally operating at capacity or over during the full There is nowhere apparent to expand these car parks. It is noted that the Council now propose to build on some of these car parks which will exacerbate this problem.
- Within the town there is already huge pressure and under capacity of GPs and dentists with no opportunity to
- Tring railway station has already had to expand its car park into the Green Belt simply to handle existing traffic at peak There is already parking chaos in the surrounding country lanes which are ill suited for parking or for expansion and further housing will require an even larger car park.
- There are no reasonable bus services and given the existing road problems of the High Street and surrounding areas, there is little opportunity to increase
- Generally, around Tring the roads are busy already with the level of traffic. Cow Lane in particular is too narrow for all traffic and even more so when lined with cars for the sports
- Tring is a cherished and historic market town in the heart of the Chilterns and we wish to keep the small market town character for residents and visitors alike.

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1884
<b>Person ID</b>	868491
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Graham Hoad
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	New housing provision is a central policy issue. Whilst many will not welcome such an increase in population, I can see that the need for provisions for supporting infrastructure is acknowledged. For example I welcome the improvements on links set out in 23.156. Success will be in the detail of final proposals.  I have commented elsewhere on the specific sites.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1927
<b>Person ID</b>	1262553
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Wallis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1967
<b>Person ID</b>	1262690
<b>Full Name</b>	Ruth Sidwell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am deeply concerned about the number of houses planned to be built in Tring. As well as concerns for the green belt and environmental issues, schools and doctors surgeries, I fear for the extra number of cars that these houses will bring to Tring.</p> <p>Tring High Street is very narrow and traffic flow is often interrupted by parked delivery vans and buses. Feeder roads to the High Street - Western Road, Miswell Lane, Christchurch Road, Dundale Road, Brook Street, Park Road and Station Road are already congested with parked cars (often on the pavements), and traffic does not flow freely.</p> <p>Will more people use Tring train station? In normal times that car park is full very early in the morning, with no alternative place to park. What provision is in place there?</p> <p>Siting a supermarket in Brook Street is only going to encourage more cars to drive through the town. It is the wrong place for a supermarket. We have a wonderful local history museum on that site which must not be lost.</p> <p>Cycle lanes are an excellent idea, but only where there is plenty of space and if they are maintained. What happens to those lanes when space is limited? Such as the High Street, the canal bridge at Tring Station and Brook Street. Pedestrians and cyclists don't mix well!</p>

Development at Roman Park on Icknield Way is well under way. As people move in, I wonder how many will walk into Tring and to sports facilities on the other side of Tring. Where will the children go to school and will they walk? I doubt it.

Please think again. Tring just could not cope with all these extra houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1972

**Person ID** 403995

**Full Name** Mrs Elizabeth Gentle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Building on farm land in Tring

I wish to take action regarding the above.

I think the number of houses proposed would spoil the green environment in Tring creating pollution and extensively altering the character of the town.

People visit Tring because it is a country town the approach from the A41 roundabout depicts its rural character .Development on the green farm land would turn it into urban sprawl affecting wild life and the environment enjoyed by the citizens.

Do we want an ugly urban market town? The infrastructure can only support and sustain a certain number of people without turning the town into a completely different place .

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1993

<b>Person ID</b>	1262714
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Winter
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Pendley Sports Centre/Pendley Sports Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly, we accept that there is the need for new housing. However, the extent of development and its location immediately to the north and west of the Pendley Sports Centre will have significant impacts on the clubs and our members. Whilst we may benefit from increased membership, we would want any new development to have as little negative impact on this important community amenity and on the wider area.</p> <p>We are concerned about the already inadequate cycle and footpath connections locally and the re-development of these two large sites will increase local movements significantly, including to and from our grounds. We are also concerned about the pressures on the surrounding open spaces the increased local population will bring and will support measures to encourage less car usage as there is already significant pressure on Cow Lane and our parking provision.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2011
<b>Person ID</b>	1262618
<b>Full Name</b>	Jasmine Jenkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The areas of housing is almost as big as the present area of Tring and with the huge number of houses proposed the population will double. This is far too much for one small market town of 12000 people.

The town centre has only one main street and already the traffic is slow going through

Pretty uch all the housing is on green spaces and countryside and it diifficult to see how this can be mitigated

Housing is expensive here and so it is unlikely to provide annything that is anywhere near affordable unless it is housing association accomodation for renting

Roman park, the new development presently being built, has very few 2 bed homes and even those are £400,000

The station has insufficient parking at present and with new commuters coming here there wil lbe no parking. The station is too far out unless there is a new frequent bus service. The cycleway that is proposed may help

In relation to the supermarket I doubt that is needed as so many people shop online now. It would just mean the car parks and the town would be more congested

I think there should be many fewer houses than planned

Also I do not think many people were even aware that this building and development was being planned as the consultation period has been during lockdown when people are less aware of what is happening due to much reduced social contact.

A rethink and new consultation period is needed

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2069

**Person ID** 1262322

**Full Name** Tony and Avril Hallett

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The following are our views on the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038).

IMPACT ON TOWN

Tring is a small market town in an area of outstanding natural beauty with a population of approximately 12,000 people. The proposed development would increase the population by 5,000 at a conservative estimate which will change the character of the town beyond recognition.

#### SPEED OF DEVELOPMENT

How many of the 2750 houses in the proposed development will be built each year? This is not clear from the information given as far as we could ascertain. The speed of building will affect traffic volumes, road restrictions and general upheaval in the town.

#### MISUSE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

The area on the plan between Station Road and Bulbourne is valuable agricultural land. Surely such land should be saved as now we have left the EU we will be growing more of our own food and importing less.

This would also apply to the land around Dunsley Farm in London Road.

#### LEASEHOLD CONCERNS

If these houses are built, will the properties be freehold or leasehold? There is a scandal emerging at the moment of large leasehold developments where householders are unable to sell their houses as their ground rent is being increased rapidly.

#### HOUSING MIX

Affordable housing for young people is mentioned several times in the report but how many of these houses will actually be affordable? From our observation of the present development in Icknield Way, many of the houses visible from the road appear to be larger detached houses.

The population of Dacorum is ageing but suitable housing for older people in Tring wishing to downsize their homes does not appear to be important.

Within a few miles of Tring the closure of RAF Halton will make hundreds of acres of land available for house building. This surely could take the pressure off the necessity to build so many houses in Tring.

#### BROOK STREET DEVELOPMENT

It was very difficult to find information about the proposed development on the Brook Street site where the Local History Museum is situated. This seems to be a rehash of a plan from the 1990's which was opposed by a majority of Tring residents who did not want a large supermarket in the centre of the town.

This proposal would involve the unnecessary demolition of the Local History Museum, the Fire Station and the Auction Rooms. To demolish the Museum would be a real act of vandalism and the town would be poorer for it. A great deal of work went into setting it up and was encouraged by Dacorum Borough Council who we believe give financial support to it.

The Auction rooms are a thriving business which in normal times brings visitors to Tring who probably would not come here otherwise.

A Fire Station in Tring is an absolute necessity now and particularly so if the number of properties is to increase. The present site is central to reaching all parts of the town speedily. It would be difficult to find an alternative site in such a good position.

The development of this small area of land would cause enormous disruption to Tring town centre. This would involve the impact of large construction vehicles on narrow roads and in a restricted space which is completely unacceptable.

#### CONCLUSION

We found the report was very large, long winded and repetitive. However, it misses key details and vital information for the residents of Tring.

In conclusion we hope the size and locations of the development will be reconsidered. We are not against the building of houses if they are necessary and of an appropriate mix of size and type. However, Tring would find it very difficult to absorb these developments and the whole character of the town would be destroyed.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2100
<b>Person ID</b>	1262789
<b>Full Name</b>	BARRY SIMMONS

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like my comments to be taken into consideration when making a decision on the above.</p> <p>While appreciating the requirements for additional housing, I do not understand why Dacorum and in particular Tring should have to provide such numbers which are way above the requirements for normal growth of the town and borough.</p> <p>Tring has already developed into a commuter town and would be very much more so, if development on the scale proposed is allowed to go ahead as the employment suggestions are far below the population increase this size of development would require.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any conditions for environmentally sustainable buildings within the plan, which should be the number one consideration in any new housing development. Something which appears to have been ignored within the latest development of LA5 in Tring.</p> <p>There are suggestions that new schools could be provided but no mention how these would be paid for.</p> <p>Also no mention of additional doctors, dentists etc.</p> <p>Our present ones can barely cope now, before the additional houses now being built are occupied.</p> <p>Yes we need more housing, but not the numbers being planned. Any housing should be affordable for locals working locally and built with the effects on the environment as the first concern.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2113
<b>Person ID</b>	1262797
<b>Full Name</b>	NICK TURNER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2140
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too big based on an outdated matrix.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2162
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2182
<b>Person ID</b>	1262762
<b>Full Name</b>	Eric Dodman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Again, your plan shows no insight into the particular problems of the elderly or disabled. There is no way that most people can do a weekly shop without using a car, The bus service is very poor and unreliable currently, despite what you say and all this was pre-COVID. In terms of a "large" foodstore, where exactly is that going to be? If you locate it in Dunsley Farm you might well find that Tesco's closes as there will be over competition in that location. If it is going to go in the town, I am not really clear about where that will be and what parking will be provided. Furthermore, your thoughtless land grab of Green Belt just looks like a disastrous quick fix with potentially horrendous results for Tring. Also, there is just not enough work available in Tring to support the number of new houses and you stand a very great risk of increasing commuting rather than reducing it. This will not play at all well into the environmental strategies you also mention at the same time. This is going to overwhelm Tring, change its nature forever and I strongly request that you sit down and review your plans.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2208
<b>Person ID</b>	1262851
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Stephenson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This process of submitting comments seems designed to ensure that it is made as complicated as possible to have your say.</p> <p>We would like to comment, as long-term family residents of Tring, on the proposals to build nearly 3,000 new homes in Tring. This proposal is unbelievably badly thought out, and would do immense damage to Tring and the surrounding environment. The proposals would roughly double the geographic size of Tring, and nearly double the population. This is way out of line with all other areas of Dacorum, and would cause immense problems for the existing population and those moving to Tring.</p> <p>The pressure this massive increase in population would put on the town is not sustainable. The town has very limited facilities for everything, for example shopping, post offices, medical facilities, schools and all other types of infrastructure.</p>

The local train line and station are unbelievably busy, and there is already not enough parking provision for commuters. Such a massive population increase would overwhelm local transport provision as well as every other sort of provision. This scale of housing development would mean thousands more people using the local area/countryside, which is already under significant pressure, as has been amply demonstrated under lockdown. The massive building programme proposed for the area down to the canal would be hugely detrimental to the canal, as well as the local reservoirs and nearby natural areas.

Some level of development in Tring, and throughout Dacorum, may well be necessary, but to propose such as massive expansion of a small town is totally unnecessary and wrong. There is already development going on in Tring, and the houses being built are highly priced and have nothing to do with affordable development. This new expansion would merely see more of the same, with huge profits being made at the expense of destroying a small town and surrounding countryside. A proper strategy for development would look at social housing and low-cost housing in areas that would not destroy the town and countryside, on a much smaller scale. As part of this, the council needs to look at the number of empty properties and second homes in the borough, to ensure that existing supply is actually being used properly.

This is supposed to be sustainable, but the level of housing proposed for Tring is most certainly not that. It is all about providing expensive houses at huge profit, with no consideration for the real needs of those needing housing, and with no consideration for what can be planned for properly with a small town and its protected countryside.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2247

**Person ID** 1262875

**Full Name** Ann Fitzgerald

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I oppose the plan as I am against the scale of the developments and against excessive development of green belt land, particularly to the east of Tring near the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I am not in favour of the excessive development of housing proposed in this area.



I call upon the Council to halt the local plan consultation. Redraw the Plan based on house densities already achieved and I demand that housing targets are reviewed and based on up-to-date estimates, rather than out-dated archaic surveys commissioned up to a decade ago.

I would also like to add the comment that the proposed increase in the number of houses in Tring by 55% is unsustainable and unnecessary and will be totally detrimental to the character, integrity and infra-structure of the town.

I would like to comment that the cpnc

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2383

**Person ID** 1254107

**Full Name** Polly Eaton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I think there is a lack of open or public space in all the proposals. Tring falls in the government designated pollinator highways, and the government has specified that they will be committed to creating pollinator highways, and throughout the country. Building on swathes of countryside is not going to enhance wildlife. There needs to be consideration to this by spaces between housing, verges and areas of biodiverse grasses and wildflowers, and wildlife corridors. See:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-pollinator-strategy-2014-to-2024-implementation-plan>

Employment and Retail – Aside from a mention of the brewery, the other businesses (Farm Shop, gym, motorcycle repair) in the Dunsley Farm area are not highlighted. This area which is scheduled to be an employment opportunity and retail (Point 9.14 suggests a large supermarket). If this happens, it also suggests the current Tesco site would be closed – for what purpose? Current business and facilities for local should be prioritised. The document calls for an ‘out of centre supermarket’ this goes against all current thinking to keep out towns vibrant. There are many local food producers and small businesses can there be accommodated there for a ‘food hub’ instead of drawing people away from local business. Office space should be in keeping with current global trends i.e. flexible office and meeting space. Businesses on these sites need to meet environmental credentials to fulfil carbon zero aspirations and can achieve these with methods such as heating, recycling, solar power installation.

An urgent consideration would be footpath and bicycle access to the rest of the town to reduce car use to this area (and the remaining housing area) ie inks with Station Road and London Road.

This space should also include (biodiverse) green space for the benefit of employees and public visiting this area, and NOT entirely concrete!

All infrastructure proposals should include solar power areas. Ideally located on buildings.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2428
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2473
<b>Person ID</b>	1263080
<b>Full Name</b>	Russell Emson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2511
<b>Person ID</b>	1262740
<b>Full Name</b>	David Ridgwell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Re Policy SP23: The proposed release of land from the Green Belt is deplorable and is contrary to the achievement of anti-pollution objectives.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2525
<b>Person ID</b>	1263143
<b>Full Name</b>	Manlet Group Holdings Limited
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1262938
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Steven Barker
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see attached statement 06091_Reps.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">06091_Reps.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2548
<b>Person ID</b>	1263181
<b>Full Name</b>	Judith Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I realise that Tring needs to have some housing increase but these proposals are absurdly large. The plans will give a 55% increase in housing which will turn our lovely market town into just another a urban commuter belt town. Why is the Tring proposal for 55% where the other towns in the borough are nearer to 9%? Has it been a simple matter of drawing neat lines on a map without any regard to the loss of the rural character of Tring. The centre of Tring is small. The roads could not cope with a large increase in cars and which will likely lead to gridlock. Account needs to be taken of all the other huge housing developments that are happening on our borders in Bucks, as a lot of people will gravitate towards Tring for shops and other services. Tring should not be seen in isolation.</p> <p>The proposed East Tring deveopment from Station Road down to Bulbourne seems to be particularly out of proportion to the town. By taking green belt you are damaging wildlife habitats and adding to the risk of flooding as those fields are often waterlogged. The town simply will not be able to cope with such a large increase in the population even with proposed new shops and a school (if they happen).</p> <p>The council should be substatially adjusting down the number of houses that are being proposed in the light of changing government decisions and the reassessment of local need.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2572
<b>Person ID</b>	1263195
<b>Full Name</b>	Jack Costin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Tring is ill-conceived and the proposed housing expansion is excessive.</p> <p>Tring is a small characterful town with with a very narrow high street (which cannot be widened) and suffers congestion whenever large vehicles such as buses and lorries meet.</p> <p>The excessive expansion of housing will exsacerbate this issue and lead to more congestion and more pollution.</p>

Retail development should be restricted in areas beyond the town centre if we do not want to see even more empty shops units in the town.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2575

**Person ID** 1263199

**Full Name** Richard Hardy

**Organisation Details** Walbrook Planning Consultants

**Agent ID** 1263197

**Agent Full Name** Richard  
Hardy

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy  
comment**

The allocation Tr03 presents a good opportunity to make a significant contribution to the Borough's housing targets in a strategic and sustainable manner. Since the allocation is at the strategic scale, it is possible to provide a suitable mix and range of housing types in order to meet the Borough's identified housing needs. The Landscape Considerations also appear to be sufficient to ensure the allocation will not have wider negative impacts on the AONB or Green Belt. It will not lead to unrestricted sprawl and will generally avoid unacceptable encroachments into the countryside. Moreover, the development will not result in any of the neighbouring towns or villages merging with Tring. Sensitive design principles for the development will further ensure this is achievable.

Dacorum's Urban Capacity Study (November 2020) confirmed that there is a lack of available brownfield land and urban sites to meet the housing needs of the Borough. Additionally, Dacorum is highly constrained by the Green Belt and therefore, any development strategy that involves any outward expansion of the towns and larger villages will inevitably necessitate the release of Green Belt land.

The proposal represents a logical extension to the existing settlement whilst also having good access to Tring Station to promote the use of public transport. Furthermore, with high-quality masterplanning, the development should help to further connect Tring to the railway station which is currently isolated and could benefit from improved active transport routes. It is noted that development would lead to the provision and/or contributions to new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Tring town centre and Tring Station, including off-site provision. It is promising that these provisions are

outlined in the Draft Plan, helping reduce future reliance on private car use and improving the sustainability of the settlement as a whole.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2615

**Person ID** 1263206

**Full Name** Andrew Farrow

**Organisation Details** Great Gaddesden Parish Council

**Agent ID** 1253616

**Agent Full Name** Andrew Farrow

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2639

**Person ID** 222269

**Full Name** Georgina Tregoning

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy: Given how the plan identifies Tring as a market town with its own characteristics, the proposal to add so many houses is totally disproportionate and in particular the proposed major expansion East of Tring will disrupt the town and totally change its ethos. Mention of pedestrianisation and cycle paths will not satisfy the needs of the population, particularly the elderly. It seems unlikely in the extreme that workers in the Dunsley Farm area would actually walk into town for shopping; this would take too much time. With regard to the proposal for Tr06, there is no need whatsoever to lose the museum. This is to the side of the site, and in a historic market building which greatly enhances the character of the town.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2643
<b>Person ID</b>	1263231
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Phil Robinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period, it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p>



To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2657

**Person ID** 1263235

**Full Name** Mrs Vanessa Robinson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period, it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2669

**Person ID** 1161597

**Full Name** Stuart Mears

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2678

**Person ID** 1263237

**Full Name** Dr Alice Mears

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2687

**Person ID** 1263240

**Full Name** Stuart and Val Burnett

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2696

**Person ID** 1263241

**Full Name** Mr Stephen Hurley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2708

**Person ID** 1263245

**Full Name** Mr Paul Barritt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2807

**Person ID** 1263303

**Full Name** MR HOWARD OAKLEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

In response to the Dacorum proposed developments in Tring.

I have been a resident of Tring for more than 30 years. As an antique dealer I have sold through Tring auction throughout this time. My home also has many items of antique furniture, purchased from Tring Market Auctions and as such the auction provides a much-needed reuse and recycle facility. I would like to add support to Stephen Hearn’s views together with his specific objections to Dacorum’s plans. In my opinion the auction contributes to keeping the town centre alive. On viewing days at the auction, many visit the general market in the town centre, take a local coffee and then peruse the auction.

On sale days there is the Farmers’ Market to compliment the auction experience. Why would you want to take this away from the town and people of Tring?

The proposed development to the east of the town will turn a vast amount of Tring into a generic housing estate at the expense of vast swathes of Green Belt countryside.

Dacorum plan to take land out of Green Belt in exceptional circumstances, but they are just falling in line with blunt Government demands, which means no Green Belt is safe. The Roman Park housing development to the west of Tring is more than enough for the town to support.

Tring has recently seen many sympathetic brown field developments in areas such as Akeman Street, Mortimer Hill, St Francis de Sales School, and the ongoing development at Bulbourne Yard. These all tend to enhance the area and are welcomed by many. We have seen many housing plot consolidations for redevelopment together with instances of garden grab, some better thought out than others.

Dacorum's proposed development flies in the face of many of their stated mantra in their recent local plan brochure, delivered through our door.

**IT DOES NOT** consider the following:

- 1 Conserving and protecting the natural
- 2 Ensuring an attractive and valued built and historic
- 3 Supporting community health, well-being, and

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2817
<b>Person ID</b>	1263287
<b>Full Name</b>	Jeremy Bonnar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive</p>



harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2845

**Person ID** 1263321

**Full Name** TSEL Secretary TSEL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

- Identifies on p232, 23.141 - *that there is no made neighbourhood plan*. Clearly, this should be the priority item for DBC ahead of any determination on the DBC Local Plan and Tornadoes looks forward to contributing to this critical input to the future Local Plan.
- In 23.146 on p234 –*significant new public open space*. Tornadoes would like to see the detail of what size, location and usage make up will be and in whose ownership this open space will be in the future. Tornadoes is determined to ensure that Tring does not suffer a Durrants Lane issue around available playing space like Berkhamsted is currently enduring and has been for 9 years now, in relation to 3 football pitches that are still not commissioned into use.

- Bullet point 4 in 23.147, sets out that DBC will *provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south*. Tornadoes, being the largest football club in the town, with circa 500 players across 33 teams, that this is actually a significant number of new football pitches and would like to see evidence in the Tr01 Developers outline plan that this requirement is fully met and at what scale.
- Bullet point 8 in 23.147 on p235, sets out that DBC will *provide and support new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and Tring Station and 23.154 Existing housing growth to the west of Tring will deliver a new east-west shared cycle and footpath that will link the existing and proposed residential neighbourhoods to the wider cycle and footpath network at the A41 roundabout and beyond to Aston Clinton. Other improvements are proposed there that will upgrade public rights of way and improve accessibility to buses*. Tornadoes supports this and is keen to see that the improved pedestrian pathways and cycle links provision for Tring reaches from LA5 in the far west of Tring and as far North as Tring Corinthians on the Icknield Way, all the way through to the top end of Cow Lane (via Station Road and the A4251, as well as through TR01) and along the A4251 to link in to the Football, Hockey and Rugby facilities at Cow Roast. They should also link TR02 and Tr03 to Cow Lane too.
- On p236 23.159 sets out *provision for associated playing fields*. Within TR01, Tr02 and Tr03, Tornadoes would like to see now what the proposed location, size and configuration of these playing fields is expected to be and what the usage arrangements for them will be.
- Bullet point 4 in 23.163 on p238 sets out that TR03 will deliver *a new sporting and leisure hub*. Tornadoes would like to see now what the proposed location, size and configuration of this sporting and leisure hub is expected to be and what the ownership & usage arrangements for them will be.
- On p239 23.165 does not make any reference to open spaces generally or football pitches in particular. For the avoidance of doubt, Tornadoes would like to see this properly defined, ahead of any development approvals.

Specifically in relation to **Policy SP25 - Delivering Growth at South East Tring** (p239/240) Tornadoes would like to see a bullet point 9 added that locks in the circa 18 hectares of land covering Cow Lane Farm down and round to the cricket and tennis clubs, as football / sports playing space from as early as September 2022. Tornadoes is ready to take on responsibility for this playing space effective immediately.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2918
<b>Person ID</b>	1263430
<b>Full Name</b>	Pru Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Again, for a historic market town, the number of houses - nearly a 50% increase on current levels seems hugely excessive.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2945
<b>Person ID</b>	1263377
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Messenger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2971
<b>Person ID</b>	1164709
<b>Full Name</b>	Dianne Pilkington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2979
<b>Person ID</b>	1263439
<b>Full Name</b>	Rod Gibberd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Tring School
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>We will work with whatever decision is made by the various authorities and local groups.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2985
<b>Person ID</b>	1263476
<b>Full Name</b>	mr John Scafe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am replying to the Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation</p> <p>The total of 2,731 houses is huge and will swamp the market town of Tring. It is not clear as whether the present building on LA5 Western Road is included, I fear not. What about Doctors Surgeries? The present surgery has had to take on half the population of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>In particular I object to the fact that we would lose the peace and pleasure of Marshcroft Lane. This is the only country lane on our doorstep and it is used by many walkers, cyclists, dog walkers, rambles -dayly. We are so lucky to have this lovely lane, where we locals can escape for a relaxing walk which can lead to the canal towpath or to Aldbury Nowers or Pitstone Hill for those who are rather fitter.</p> <p>If development must take place, the preference is the area between Cow Lane and Tesco.</p>

There was a proposal to develop land off the Icknield Way, opposite the end of New Road, which would be a much better option. Why is that not mentioned?  
 With regard to the details for central Tring, I find these unclear. Mention is made of increasing retail space. Well, we have so many empty shops already! I could not tell from the maps whether you propose town centre development here or not.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS2986

**Person ID** 1258924

**Full Name** Natalia Maghdoori

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3012

**Person ID** 1263484

**Full Name** LINDA DI MIZIO

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The level of new housing proposed for Tring, amounting to an increase of over 50%, would be out of all proportion to the existing town, its character and infrastructure. The planned development to the east of Tring, between Station Road, Bulbourne Road and the canal, would swallow up the hamlet of Tring Station, using greenbelt land that provides a buffer between the town of Tring and the Chilterns AONB. Transport links are already under extreme pressure, with main roads congested, and Tring Station has operated at full capacity for some years with parking particularly an issue for the area and in normal times no ability to park at the station after the early morning rush. In addition, the roads around Tring Station are narrow, made more so by resident on-street parking,

I note that the strategy for growth in Tring includes providing employment opportunities, which is something which would be welcome for the existing population; however, the area remains primarily a commuter area and I fear that Tring could lose its remaining character as a market town with a disproportionately high level of housing to availability of local jobs.

Changes in retail shopping habits in recent years, accelerated by the covid epidemic, may indicate that fewer supermarkets and other retail outlets will be required and I would therefore think that the proposals for additional supermarkets require review, while small scale local convenience stores may provide for local needs. In any case, it would seem inappropriate to site another supermarket in the Dunsley Farm area where a Tesco supermarket stands opposite. The option of a

supermarket in the High Street/Brook Street area would also be superfluous to requirements in my view and I would much prefer to see a weekly market reinstated on the old market site, providing local produce, crafts, clothing, household items and so on.

Finally, I envisage that the proposed plans for further development around Berkhamsted and Tring, along with existing and future planned development by Aylesbury Vale around Aston Clinton would lead to an unacceptable level of urban sprawl and I dearly hope that Dacorum will review the plan.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3029
<b>Person ID</b>	1263492
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Craig Murphy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly object to the current plans relating to the development of Tring as set out in Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth Proposals. It is presented as the opportunity to deliver sustainable and distinctive local developments whilst protecting and enhancing our surroundings but unfortunately does not deliver this in its current guise. I would summarise my comments as below;</p> <p>General points / objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plan increases the population by over a quarter which would unbalance the size of the centre in proportion to the amount of housing. The centre and local amenities would become overcrowded. Is this scale of housing really needed given other recent developments including LA5 site Roman Park. Seems excessive and unjustifiable.</li> <li>- Tring is a very small, rural town and the proposals for it would completely destroy its character.</li> <li>- The plans will also provide an unacceptable strain on the core infrastructure of the town - the traffic through the high street and the main access roads from both exits of the A41, parking in the town centre as well parking at the Train station and trains into London.</li> <li>- The plans result in an unacceptably high loss of greenbelt land.</li> </ul> <p>I would ask that the Council revisit these plans with the following in mind;</p>



- significantly reduce the volume of new housing shown which is not warranted and in excess of natural population growth.  
 - Retain green belt land to a far greater extent.  
 Apply more vision to town centre development plans and demonstrate more sympathy and appreciation to retain and build on the unique character of Tring as an historical market town.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3081

**Person ID** 1263505

**Full Name** Mrs Sonia Ong

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I am writing to inform you of dismay and unrest regarding the planning proposed for Tring the town I live in.  
 I wish my anti proposed planning comment to be logged as what is being proposed is simply despicable.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3082

**Person ID** 1263499

**Full Name** Mrs Angela Burgin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3122
<b>Person ID</b>	1263514
<b>Full Name</b>	SAM LETHEREN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3139
<b>Person ID</b>	488516
<b>Full Name</b>	mr hugh siegle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3143
<b>Person ID</b>	1263526
<b>Full Name</b>	MR NICK RIPPER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p>

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3163

**Person ID** 1263535

**Full Name** TONY OGDEN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident in Mortimer hill, Tring for the last 56 years, my wife and I have seen large changes to Tring and this area over these years but the current level of proposed development in terms of extra housing and, in consequence the increased level of vehicles and severe strain on all services and resources, is in our view not justified and very alarming .

We would like to register a strong objection to the extra levels proposed (i.e. plus 55%) and plus 3000 houses on Green Belt land, much of which is in the vicinity.

This immediate area is at present very congested anyway, due to the presence of 2 major schools and associated traffic ,i.e. double decker buses and coaches and private cars. We believe than even an increase of a third of the numbers proposed, would impose a severe strain on the current resources, apart from ruining some of the countryside that we have remaining .,

Considering what is currently under development at the west end of Tring, there is little justification for massively expanding the town further, despite the governments insistence that all this extra bricks, mortar and concrete is necessary !  
Please register these comments with the appropriate authority and involved persons.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3167

**Person ID** 1263537

**Full Name** MRS SARAH RIPPER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3182

**Person ID** 1263550

**Full Name** ANNABEL FRANCIS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3184

**Person ID** 1263540

**Full Name** Karlis Ziepitis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

When quoting **23.140** Growth at Tring will also need to be sensitive in its design and landscape to the surrounding landscape and heritage context, including the Chilterns AONB, and protecting and enhancing the market town attributes of the town centre, including its shopping and service role.

How can a 55% increase achieve this? Tring as stated is or you can say was a small market town, it will no longer be this. I would turn round and say the proposed development do not consider this. It is based on a government target for growth.

As a resident of Tring I have seen gradual changes, times change, but to turn a small market town into a little London is not the reason why most people reside in Tring. The current developments seems to be based on un-affordable housing for people in the local area and more towards housing to create the most profit.



Enhance not destroy. Green not greed. Consider not inconsiderate.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3191

**Person ID** 1263530

**Full Name** Mr Thomas Jennings

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing, not as a resident of Tring itself but of one of the surrounding villages, to air my concerns regarding the proposed development of site Tr01.

While I accept the pressing need for more affordable housing (with a strong emphasis on 'affordable' - not just more middle-class commuter homes) at a national level and the subsequent pressure this is creating for local authorities to meet their share of housebuilding targets - as well as the tendency for a degree of NIMBYism around any such plans - in this particular case, I believe the proposals for site Tr01 to be flawed.

Whether the proposed development will, as suggested, indeed alter the fundamental character of Tring as a town is a subjective argument. What is not subjective is the fact that we are all facing a combined climate and biodiversity crisis which is only going to get worse over the coming years, unless we start to prioritise the need for nature over our seemingly insatiable desire for economic growth and unsustainable business as usual.

As an environmentalist, I would be arguing against these proposals even if they were slated for a relatively anonymous greenfield area, but the fact the proposed site sits alongside Chilterns AONB, in close proximity to nationally important ecosystems and wildlife habitats including native beech woodlands and fragile chalk streams, only makes the environmental and ecological case against it even clearer.

As a parent of a young child, I fear for the future legacy we will leave for future generations if we continue to build on sites like this one with only token consideration for nature. I have also seen the pressure on local services like schools and GP surgeries first-hand and worry that Dacorum is putting the cart before the horse in terms of proposing existing housing for a town that only really has the infrastructure of a large village at present.

Finally, at a time when more than ever before we are seeing the importance for public health of preserving access to open spaces, I worry about the potential impacts of this proposed development on existing public rights of way across the land.

If the housing development proposed for site Tr01 absolutely must go ahead - if there really are no suitable alternative sites, despite recent changes to brownfield regulations etc, then I believe Dacorum has the opportunity to make a powerful statement of intent that could earn it recognition at a national level, by demanding not only that developers avoid packing in yet more generic 'econobox' housing but instead

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3202

**Person ID** 1263567

**Full Name** Malcolm and Linda Cooper

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I write in response to the public consultation in progress and relating to the proposals outlined in the brochure and on line by DBC for housing development in the Towns of Tring Berkhamsted and Northchurch.

My initial thoughts are that the calculations are WRONG and the numbers of required dwellings have been manipulated by the government algorithms to increase from 355 to over 1000 per year from 2021 to 2038. This alarming unjustified enhancement will undoubtedly impact on Green Belt land and ANOB. The planned development sites show this to be fact and those that don't fall in this category are destined to be shrouded in pollution from the A41 traffic.

My wife and I live in Northchurch, a parish within its own right and supporting its own Parish Council. DBC have opted to refer to us as West Berkhamsted and as such, little if any thought has been given to the huge unsustainable impact it will have to bear. There is just one road connecting Tring with Berkhamsted and that is very narrow at points, totally unsuitable to cope with the vast increase of traffic should these proposal sites be approved.

The infrastructure improvements outlined in the proposal do not go anywhere near far enough. The station car parks at both Tring and Berkhamsted are full to capacity with commuter traffic every working day. The Doctors and Dentists are overstretched and the Hospitals seemingly unable to cope. Shop parking is sparse and where will the water come from. One good summer and bans are imposed.

Your proposals will permanently change our delightful market towns into urban sprawls that are not sustainable and the loss of Green Belt is irresponsible. Wildlife through loss of habitat will suffer and once gone can never be replaced. This is unthinkable and absolutely not what we want for future generations.

Let us not overlook that reportedly there are 600 000 EMPTY properties in England and innumerable brownfield sites. Concreting over fields is totally unnecessary. They must be preserved for our future.

I would encourage a response.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS3205

**Person ID**

1263568

**Full Name**

Mrs Suzy Hudson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I strongly object to the proposal that Tring is required to “play a much greater role in delivering housing growth” within the borough - a 55% growth (2,700 houses) in housing in Tring. As a result of this Council growth proposal for Tring, there is a disproportionate Green Belt allocation required to build the houses than there would be if the housing growth was shared more proportionately across all settlements i.e. 23% growth in Hemel Hempstead with the remaining growth shared equally between the remaining settlements.

Whilst I accept that the aspirations for existing and new residents and visitors should be met, this should not come at the direct expense of substantial and unjustified housing growth that substantially impacts upon the openness of the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

I strongly object to your claim that your vision of Tring has “delivered a comprehensively planned new neighbourhood to the east of the town in a way that takes account of sensitive views, landscape or protected environmental sites.” This Local Plan draft has failed to bring forward exceptional circumstances so as to justify what is a significant intrusion into the open Green Belt to the East of Tring.

Any new planned development to the east of town would by way of its introduction fail to take account of the sensitive views, landscape and protected environmental sites that is sought to be addressed by way of the vision. Such is the sensitivity of the land in question that any change to its use, particularly that associated with the introduction of built infrastructure would cause unquestionable damage to the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for which there has been no evidence for its justification and no evidence to identify that it can be sufficiently mitigated.

I welcome the requirement to provide a mix of market and affordable housing together with new community facilities and economic growth within the area. I believe that such delivery can be delivered proportionally and reasonably within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring and other settlements and that the opportunities in this regard have not been sufficiently examined.

The requirement for two primary schools and a secondary school is a by-product of the substantial housing growth proposed to be allocated within the Local Plan that I strongly object to. Such wide scale growth to Tring has not been sufficiently justified and as such the requirement for two further primary schools and a secondary school are as a by-product and therefore likely to be unnecessary.

The delivery of open space and sports and leisure facilities should be encouraged, however such facilities and open space should not be delivered at the expense of the loss of widespread open countryside and land which contributes to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty given that such a loss would be substantial and would defeat the purpose of seeking to secure new open space and leisure facilities for the health and wellbeing of local people. Consideration should be given to the opportunity to deliver new open space and sports and leisure facilities in their own right instead of such facilities being packaged into a wider growth strategy that includes an inappropriate provision of housing growth.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS3212
<b>Person ID</b>	404019
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jean McDonnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I feel the Dacorum local plan for Tring is totally unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is far too large for the area</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure. Doctors practices are overfull now making it difficult to get appointments even without the extra requirements there will be due to current building.</p> <p>Schools are also very oversubscribed.</p> <p>Parking in the town, in normal circumstances, is insufficient. Most houses will generate two extra cars. Parking in private roads is a big problem &amp; daytime parking on grass verges, particularly at school pick up times, is a real hazard.</p> <p>If extra houses are built more green belt land is required not less &amp; more recreation areas not less.</p> <p>Keep this an area of natural beauty by building only an appropriate number of houses.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to come first.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3214
<b>Person ID</b>	1263571
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sylvia Wren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to express my concerns about the proposed development in Tring .</p> <p>My concerns are as follows.</p> <p>An increase of new housing amounting to over 50% is completely out of proportion to the existing town. Infrastructure would be unsustainable.</p> <p>Transport links and roads are already under extreme pressure.</p> <p>Schools, Doctors surgeries etc would be overwhelmed.</p> <p>I would state that the proposed plan for future development around the berkhamsted and Tring, together with planned development in Aylesbury Vale would result in a level of urban sprawl which is totally unacceptable.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3226
<b>Person ID</b>	1142856
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Susan Pike
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My husband and I moved to Tring from Middlesex in 1966 as Tring is a lovely small town and yes we purchased a new home which was a semi detached with reasonable garden. Over the following years Tring did expand with new homes and which used land but rarely green belt which to me is sacrosanct and not be used for building. We are having massive climate change and tress, green areas that wildlife especially bees etc. can help maintain the equilibrium of the area.</p> <p>Any land for houses and industry should be using brownfield sites where possible. Tring does not have the infrastructure for almost doubling the size of the town. The hospital in Hemel Hempstead is fast disappearing with no plans to build any new hospital but to stick with Watford Hospital which is in a cramped position in the middle of Watford which most resident hate going to as the parking is disastrous and the building terrible.</p>

The population of Tring could almost double and where are the children supposed to go to school as new ones are on the plan "as potential" which means nothing. There are not enough GP surgeries.

We are told that we should walk to keep in good health which I agree with wholeheartedly but it seems that the areas where we can walk from home without having to drive to are to be diminished. I walked my dog across a public footpath in Cow Lane farm for years but it seems that it will be a housing, industrial and "potential" school. We must not allow these green areas to be destroyed.

I could go on but I would like to add some wording from the "Grove Fields Resident Association" which has set out what their reasoning for opposing much of the plan:-

*"I strongly dispute the scale of the target for housing in Dacorum raised within this Local Plan - a 25% growth (16,596 houses) in housing, there is no evidence to support this 25% growth, especially considering there is a 9% (5,950 houses) population growth forecast by the ONS in Dacorum for the same period. I believe there is enough non-green belt land identified within the Dacorum Local Plan to provide 5,950 houses. I agree with the plan's approach to prioritise housing growth in Hemel Hempstead - a 23% growth (10,600 houses) in housing, it is clear that this facilitates the ability to make the most efficient use of brownfield land, local services to facilitate housing growth whilst minimising any potential impacts upon the Green Belt. The new local plan vision provides for a substantially disproportionate growth strategy for housing within Tring (55% growth) that fails to acknowledge the contribution that Bovington, Kings Langley and Markyate should provide towards the Local Plan period - only a 13% growth in housing in these settlements. I strongly object to the proposal that Tring is required to "play a much greater role in delivering housing growth" within the borough - a 55% growth (2,700 houses) in housing in Tring. As a result of this Council growth proposal for Tring, there is a disproportionate Green Belt allocation required to build the houses than there would be if the housing growth was shared more proportionately across all settlements i.e. 23% growth in Hemel Hempstead with the remaining growth shared equally between the remaining settlements. Whilst I accept that the aspirations for existing and new residents and visitors should be met, this should not come at the direct expense of substantial and unjustified housing growth that substantially impacts upon the openness of the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*

*I strongly object to your claim that your vision of Tring has "delivered a comprehensively planned new neighbourhood to the east of the town in a way that takes account of sensitive views, landscape or protected environmental sites." This Local Plan draft has failed to bring forward exceptional circumstances so as to justify what is a significant intrusion into the open Green Belt to the East of Tring. Any new planned development to the east of town would by way of its introduction fail to take account of the sensitive views, landscape and protected environmental sites that is sought to be addressed by way of the vision. Such is the sensitivity of the land in question that any change to its use, particularly that associated with the introduction of built infrastructure would cause unquestionable damage to the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for which there has been no evidence for its justification and no evidence to identify that it can be sufficiently mitigated. I welcome the requirement to provide a mix of market and affordable housing together with new community facilities and economic growth within the area. I believe that such delivery can be delivered proportionally*

*and reasonably within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring and other settlements and that the opportunities in this regard have not been sufficiently examined. The requirement for two primary schools and a secondary school is a by-product of the substantial housing growth proposed to be allocated within the Local Plan that I strongly object to. Such wide scale growth to Tring has not been sufficiently justified and as such the requirement for two further primary schools and a secondary school are as a by-product and therefore likely to be unnecessary. The delivery of open space and sports and leisure facilities should be encouraged, however such facilities and open space should not be delivered at the expense of the loss of widespread open countryside and land which contributes to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty given that such a loss would be substantial and would defeat the purpose of seeking to secure new open space and leisure facilities for the health and wellbeing of local people. Consideration should be given to the opportunity to deliver new open space and sports and leisure facilities in their own right instead of such facilities being packaged into a wider growth strategy that includes an inappropriate provision of housing growth."*

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3254

**Person ID** 1155396

**Full Name** Jane Hodgson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within



Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3288
<b>Person ID</b>	1263610
<b>Full Name</b>	BRYN HENRY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3301

**Person ID** 1263620

**Full Name** EMMA SIMMONDS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3314

**Person ID** 1263631

**Full Name** GAVIN NICHOL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3329
<b>Person ID</b>	1263643
<b>Full Name</b>	IAN DESTTE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3355
<b>Person ID</b>	1012318
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Hennell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Area Planner Canal and River Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Any new residential or employment uses adjacent to the canal or likely to result in an increase in its use should recognise the benefits the canal towpath can bring and actively look at ways these benefits can be increased and improved upon. This could include improvements to the towpath to allow it to be used more as a sustainable transport route but also include waterbased recreation and access facilities such as car parking. Developers should contribute to the costs of improving and maintaining these facilities through S106 and CIL payments. The canal towpath is particularly important here as a route to the Tring Reservoirs, link to the Grand Union Triangle flagship GI project and towards Aston Clinton and beyond.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3441
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Plan states:  “23.139 Growth will need to be carefully managed in order to take account of existing local highway, sustainable transport, primary and secondary schooling requirements, service constraints, and open space deficiencies in the town. As a consequence, growth will be sustainable transport / accessibility and infrastructure led and be chiefly brought forward as larger releases to help deliver these. New development will need to contribute towards increasing capacity/upgrading of local infrastructure, as appropriate.”</p> <p><i>Comment: With Tring clearly identified in DBC evidence as having a significant need for increased sporting facilities (especially playing field space) for its existing population, it is vital that additional space for the more than 50% increase</i></p>

*in population proposed in this plan is an infrastructure priority. With this in mind at least one major new sporting hub is required – ideally situated adjacent to existing sporting facilities in Tr01 – plus space to expand existing clubs. Tring Sports Forum have identified a further 15 Ha of playing field space as being required to meet existing demand. This may need to be increased by 50% to meet the demand by 2038 so it is imperative that sporting space allocation is a key priority for the Local Plan, Infrastructure Plan and site allocation considerations in Tring.*

The Plan states:

“23.147 The strategic sites offer an opportunity to provide additional facilities for the new and existing residents through the creation of a neighbourhood centre / community hub and through dual / community use of the associated new schools and their playing fields. ...

... provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south;”

*Comment: As mentioned above regarding the need for massive increase in playing facilities and expansion in Tring, it is not only the clubs previously mentioned who need room for expansion but also many other clubs in the town (e.g. Cricket, Hockey, Tennis and Netball). For these clubs, the space to expand their playing facilities, and to link them up with other clubs to maximise use, is far more important than green corridors to access them. The location of new sporting facilities and how they are integrated and managed by the established and well-run clubs in the Town is critical to make the maximum sporting use of available space in the town. Get this wrong now and the development of sport in Tring will be stifled and constrained for generations.*

*Please also refer to our overall submission (attached) which highlights that Sports Clubs are the modern community centres with touchlines and clubhouses being key meeting places for community, families, young people and even businesses. As well as providing organised play space clubs typically also provide casual open space for public access. These are meeting and playing spaces that the clubs and local communities care for, maintain and police to ensure they maximise safe public use while protecting against misuse and abuse. This is nowhere more visible than in Tring.*

The Plan states:

### **Delivering Growth in East Tring**

“23.163 The development will deliver socially inclusive communities, particularly genuinely affordable homes, sustainable energy infrastructure to address climate change and creating walkable neighbourhoods and enhanced cycling provision. There is a need to bring forward a Masterplan for the area which delivers the following:

- around 1,800 homes (including provision for older people);
- a primary school
- a secondary school
- a new sporting and leisure hub; and
- a network of green spaces, including the delivery of Suitable Alternative Greenspace (SANG) if required.

Policy SP24 - The Council will bring forward a series of comprehensively planned urban extension to the East of Tring in accordance with a Masterplan led approach and based on the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) Garden City Principles. The Masterplan will be prepared by the Council and adopted as an SPD but be prepared in collaboration with key partners and landowners and be subject to community and stakeholder involvement.”

*Comment: The Dunsley Farm Site Tr01 in South East Tring has for some time been the priority site for new sporting development and expansion in Tring (see comments below). However, with a need for extra facilities in excess of 15 Ha to meet current needs, with the proposed 50% plus expansion of the town, then it is clear that more than one major new sporting location will be required for an even larger allocation of new land for sport in Tring. Therefore, the inclusion of a proposed sporting hub in the development Tr03 is also welcomed; as long as there is appropriate consultation with local clubs and DSN to ensure it is delivered sustainably and with full local partnership and engagement.*

**23.165 - Policy SP25 - Delivering Growth at South East Tring**

*Comment: The Dunsley Farm Site Tr01 in South East Tring is the preferred site for sporting development in the local community because it is adjacent to existing clubs who are seeking to expand and can provide a sustainable delivery plan for that site. This has been made clear to DBC and its planners for many years and is supported by the Town Council. It is vital therefore that priority should be given to allocating space within this site for expansion of local sports clubs and their playing space in order to meet both existing demand and the increased demand inevitably associated with the massive increase in the population of the Town. As more than 15Ha of additional space has been identified as being needed for current demand alone then it is clear that not only should this site incorporate a major new sporting hub but that an additional hub in another new site (e.g.Tr03) is also required. Consultation and partnerships with local clubs, Tring Sports Forum and DSN should be a prerequisite for this development as well as Tr03.*

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Dacorum Sports Network - Andy Criddle DSN response to local plan overview_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3483
<b>Person ID</b>	1263805
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period; and given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</i></p> <p><i>Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances for Tring.</i></p> <p><i>Given that MCHLG have updated their position by confirming that they do not propose to proceed with the specific changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need, the Council need to halt progress of their Emerging Plan so as to reconsider their housing need requirements, taking into consideration the updated Government Advice.</i></p> <p>The Plan states:  “23.152 With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street, due to inter urban commuting patterns, Tring does not suffer significant problems as the road network across town is fairly permeable.”</p> <p><i>Comment: Tring High Street is a major congestion point regularly affected by any maintenance work to road surface, underground services or High St buildings. With no rear delivery access to shops and businesses on the High St there is also major congestion resulting from any vehicle stopping to make deliveries on the High St.</i></p> <p><i>There is already a shortage of parking for access to High St shops, businesses and leisure outlets and this will only be exacerbated by the more than 50% increase in population and the traffic associated with it – especially when the new development are further from the town centre than all the current housing within the town, and in many cases beyond walking distance.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3517
<b>Person ID</b>	1263824
<b>Full Name</b>	Nichola Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period; and given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</i></p> <p><i>Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances for Tring.</i></p> <p><i>Given that MCHLG have updated their position by confirming that they do not propose to proceed with the specific changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need, the Council need to halt progress of their Emerging Plan so as to reconsider their housing need requirements, taking into consideration the updated Government Advice.</i></p> <p>The Plan states:  “23.152 With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street, due to inter urban commuting patterns, Tring does not suffer significant problems as the road network across town is fairly permeable.”</p> <p><i>Comment: Tring High Street is a major congestion point regularly affected by any maintenance work to road surface, underground services or High St buildings. With no rear delivery access to shops and businesses on the High St there is also major congestion resulting from any vehicle stopping to make deliveries on the High St.</i></p> <p><i>There is already a shortage of parking for access to High St shops, businesses and leisure outlets and this will only be exacerbated by the more than 50% increase in population and the traffic associated with it – especially when the new development are further from the town centre than all the current housing within the town, and in many cases beyond walking distance</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3633
<b>Person ID</b>	1263885
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Neil Roberts
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3743
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3749
<b>Person ID</b>	1260822
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Banham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having read the document Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020 – 2038 I wish to register the strongest and most heartfelt objection to the plan because it would destroy Tring as we know it.</p> <p>The scale of new house building is impossible to comprehend and the destruction of green belt is totally unacceptable. Tring is a small market town. This plan would totally alter and destroy its character.</p> <p>I understand that the country as whole needs to provide sufficient housing for the needs of the people and I have no objection to sensitive development on a scale suitable for the area. This plan is hideous.</p> <p>It would appear to offer a whole new town to the east of Tring. New schools are mentioned but what of Doctors, dentists, shops and any sort of sense of community? This would not be part of Tring.</p> <p>I can only hope that this ghastly travesty will be slashed and a sensible level of development will be made to our beloved town</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3770
<b>Person ID</b>	1260970
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Edie Marchant
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have lived in Tring for many years and it is an understatement to say that I am appalled by Dacorum Borough Council's proposed scale of development in and around the town. To increase the number of houses by 55% is totally beyond any reasonable or sustainable level of development in view of all the pressure on existing facilities that such an influx of new residents will bring or, furthermore, that 3,000 houses will be build on green-belt land. Facilities, such as car parking to mention a minor issue, are already over-stretched by recent in-filling development in the town.</p> <p>On both counts - of over-development and the destruction of green-belt land in an area of outstanding natural beauty - I strongly condemn this plan.</p> <p>What is to become of England's "green and pleasant land"? It will have no meaning at all here if this level of development is allowed to proceed.</p> <p>Surely the point of building HS2 (which I also deplore on every economic, developmental and environmental ground that I can think of) is to "rebalance" the economy and, if that is the case and construction is to proceed, then surely it follows that building development should be rebalanced, providing more homes away from the over-crowded counties around London.</p> <p>It is time we put an end to this over-development of our environment and our town, over-development such as we have already seen in Aston Clinton and too many other towns.</p> <p>However, although we are told that we should have a say in these developments and are invited to respond, this will not have any meaningful outcome unless and until there is some fundamental change in the way the planning authorities are forced by government to be truly responsive to the views of local residents. That we should have some opportunity to make our voices and our concerns heard in a meaningful way is too long overdue. I hope that in this case someone is listening to what residents have to say.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3841
<b>Person ID</b>	1153890
<b>Full Name</b>	elisabeth Bendall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><i>THE TOWN OF TRING</i></b></p> <p><i>DBC Plan: - “Tring will accommodate growth of at least 2,700 new homes. Development will enhance the town centre and strengthen its function as a key market town.”</i></p> <p>The above statement is false. The number of new homes would overwhelm Tring with its very limited services and infrastructure, and the character of our town would be destroyed for ever.</p> <p><i><u>Tring Town Centre Sustainable Transport and Movement</u> - DBC Plan: - “With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street, due to inter urban commuting patterns, Tring does not suffer significant problems as the road network across town is fairly permeable.”</i></p> <p>This statement is incorrect. In normal times, there is constant congestion on Tring’s town centre roads such as Western Road, High Street, Brook Street, and Wingrave Road – all bus routes. These roads are restricted in width due to residents’ parked cars and delivery vehicles. Tring comprises a network of closely packed residential roads with roadside parking, and insufficient public car parking. Traffic from new developments is not sustainable and will add to congestion, inhibit bus travel, reduce air quality, and make Tring an unattractive place to visit.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3842
<b>Person ID</b>	1263980

<b>Full Name</b>	Lauren Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am writing to you as an HP23 resident to strongly object to “Dacorum’s Emerging Strategy for Growth Plan 2020-2038”, specifically in relation to the historic market town of Tring.</p> <p>Tring is a local market town that is widely regarded as one of the most scenic areas in the country; a reputation which could be destroyed by your proposed increased development of 55%. Given that the entire borough of Dacorum is only predicted a population increase of 9%, it seems unreasonable that the developments for our small town are in line with a 55% increase; even more so when considering the damaging effect this could have on Tring’s reputation as a small market town. The current green belt areas, which you propose to develop for housing, flood excessively in the winter months and are regarded as part of the “outstanding natural beauty” which makes Tring so desirable. It makes much more sense to repurpose the current vacant commercial properties in Tring (such as the empty banks, betting stores and travel agents on the high street) than developing on rural land, which add to the appeal of living at the foot of the Chilterns. Although there may be a need for more housing, Tring is not a suitable location for such industrial developments, especially given the proposed size and scale in proportion to the predicted growth of both the town and Dacorum’s population.</p> <p>Furthermore, the destruction of historic town heritage sites, such as the marketplace, in replacement for unnecessary retail and infrastructure is outrageous. The appeal of the high street alone comes from the small, local businesses, which have been severely impacted financially following the ongoing global pandemic. They need a chance to recover following this economic crisis; the introduction of new, large stores would hinder this, as well as destroying more of the town’s local appeal. Proof of this lies within the vacant buildings in the town centre which, as aforementioned, could be utilised for growth and development over green belt and rural areas. Additionally, the current essential shops in Tring, such as Tesco and Marks &amp; Spencer, serve the local community more than adequately. Other shopping facilities can be found in Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead, if residents cannot find what they desire in these local stores and supermarkets. It is also important to consider the future and sustainability of the hospitality and retail sector, given the changing needs of people following the pandemic. More people are ordering online from chain stores and high street brands, therefore meaning that the proposed retail and industrial developments for Tring are far from necessary. The local community has already voiced support for the current family run businesses, which contribute hugely to the small town appeal of our picturesque high street, and have thrived despite the current situation. Equally as importantly, by building on and developing</p>

the marketplace, you are removing part of this town's heritage in a place which is still used regularly in line with the local traditions (e.g. the weekly farmer's market).

If the need for housing development and retail/infrastructure really is so pressing, you should be repurposing the vacant brownfield sites situated within the high street. It is important to consider the sustainability of a retail/infrastructure development, given the ongoing pandemic and the impact this has already had on Tring's popular local businesses. To conclude, given that the appeal of Tring is its small, close knit community, market town heritage and rural beauty, your proposed plans for development are far too extreme and would destroy the characteristics of the town and rural community that we, as HP23 residents, are so proud of.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3864

**Person ID** 1263990

**Full Name** Jean Kuipers

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am deeply concerned at DBC's proposed plans to increase the size of Tring. Whilst understanding that houses are needed, particularly affordable and social housing, I cannot comprehend why Tring is required to take a larger share than other villages and towns in the DBC region. It is necessary to build more houses but the number of homes envisaged for the area and the impact thereafter will alter the character and charm of this market town for ever. With shopping habits altered, not least by the Covid19 pandemic, it should be possible to find other brown sites before encroaching on open spaces.

Have the council taken into consideration the implications for the local infrastructure and facilities? Not only schools, doctors' surgeries and recreation facilities but water supply which will be put under severe strain. This, in turn, will be detrimental to the aquifer and wonderful chalk streams which grace the Chilterns and are at risk.

We are fortunate to live in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, much of which has been protected by Green Belt. Wild space is needed to combat climate change and, especially in these unprecedented times, to provide local communities with open areas which aid physical and mental health.



Please look again at your proposal and really consider the implications on Tring and the surrounding countryside.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS3989

**Person ID** 1261840

**Full Name** Rachel Heath

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4001

**Person ID** 1263249

**Full Name** Claire Whitely

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The 55% growth strategy proposed for Tring is dramatically larger than the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum over the same time period. Within these plans, I object to the disproportionately high allocation for Tring considering this expected population growth.</p> <p>There has been insufficient evidence provided to justify the use of green belt land for delivering the housing strategy. The council has not identified the exceptional circumstances that would be required to justify the irreversible damage to the green belt and AONB that would be done with development at Tr02 and Tr03. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>Until an assessment of the opportunity to fill housing needs within the existing settlement boundaries and a more thorough assessment of the actual needs for the borough have been done, the strategy as it stands (with the allocation of Tr02 and TR03) is inappropriate and unjustified</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4018
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	TR03 - East of Tring. This is gross miss use of greenfield area and will spoil the Grand Untion Canal and Ashridge area.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4160
<b>Person ID</b>	1262892
<b>Full Name</b>	Jean Farrer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I rely on the Grovefield Tring submission for this section. Tring will be overwhelmed and lose its character with this high increase of housing.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4215
<b>Person ID</b>	1264301
<b>Full Name</b>	James Stringer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>It's not possible to grow a town by 55% in such a short space of time without fundamentally changing its character. It will also be impossible to build on green belt land in an AONB while remaining sensitive to the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive</p>

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4241

**Person ID** 1264320

**Full Name** JACKIE GLOSSOP

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4353

**Person ID** 1261193

**Full Name** Nicola Baker

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am emailing you as a resident of Dacorum and Tring. I strongly object to the current local housing plan proposals for Dacorum and particularly for Tring.

The current plan relies far too much on the use of valuable green belt land. Whilst the government allows for use of some green belt in 'exceptional circumstances' I feel Dacorum are misusing this guideline with the plan using 60% of green belt land. This is not only an unacceptable amount it is also misleading as whilst it maybe 60% in Dacorum overall it is far exceeding 60% of green belt in the proposal for Tring. In fact the majority of the proposal is on current greenbelt land in Tring, which is completely insupportable and wholly objectionable. This massive use of green belt land is damaging to this area of outstanding natural beauty, to our wildlife, ancient hedgerows and general well being. If the current situation has showed us anything it's that people need access to green spaces for their mental health, please don't let all this essential green space be taken from the residents of Tring and Dacorum. One such area within the plans currently used by the children and people of Tring for multiple sports including our local football and rugby teams. This is essential green space that must not be so easily dismissed and built on.

The percentage of housing allocated to Tring is double per population head than that planned for the rest of Dacorum. We are a small town and whilst there must be some growth the scope of these plans far exceeds what is necessary, required and sustainable for the town to support. Far too many houses in the wrong places. The amount of housing planned for Tring will overwhelm our small market town, our roads, our local amenities and bring with it greater pollution from the increase in cars and traffic. Our over subscribed schools cannot take more children. The only secondary school in Tring though undergoing a massive rebuild is NOT expanding its capacity for students. The massive housing development therefore will swamp our the school and leave the Dacorum villages surround Tring with no where to go. Once again this is unacceptable. The town in normal times already has full doctors surgeries, over subscribed secondary and primary schools, packed supermarkets and busy roads it cannot take the massive influx of the quantity of new residents suggested in the plans. It will already struggle to accommodate the new residents of the housing developments currently being built on Tring green belt. Our historic town centre was never designed to support such a huge amount of residents and all that those residents bring with them.

Please protect our historic market town and our green belt from being over run with ill thought out housing developments. For any future housing developments please stop the unsympathetic building of cramped housing with minimal green spaces and gardens. These housing 'estates' are always of a standard 'one design fits all' plan by large companies that do not retain the character of the town. Please go further insisting that the houses built follow the highest levels of sustainable green measures to protect this town, its residents and ultimately this planet for future generations.

Please stop the current plans, revise the sums of what is needed and where. Make the plans fit this local area and it's current residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4365

<b>Person ID</b>	1262873
<b>Full Name</b>	Donna Atkinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring. In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4378

<b>Person ID</b>	871443
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Rouse
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having read the booklet on the above plan and wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>I have lived in Tring for over 40 years and have watched the town grow in a pleasant way. The advent of the bypass improved the centre of our town with its narrow High Street. Even with most of the lorries diverting along the bypass, the High Street still struggles with traffic coming through and with narrow pavements is already something of a hazard for pedestrians. This horrendous plan to increase our population by 50% will ruin Tring as a market town.</p> <p>Tring is a town of 13,000/14,000 residents in an area of outstanding natural beauty and you are proposing 2731 new houses to overload our local facilities. Have you taken a detailed walk down Tring High Street to see the facilities we have to offer?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4380
<b>Person ID</b>	871443
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Rouse
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



**Tring Delivery Strategy  
comment**

Crucially we have no bank and only a tiny post office which will struggle to cope with more residents. We have 2 supermarkets which do serve the current population well; 2 excellent hardware shops, too many hairdressers and coffee shops and estate agents alongside other small individual shops, which are very important.

The High Street cannot be extended, neither should it be, as the character of the town would be spoilt.

You quote “The creation of healthy communities is essential in delivering our vision for Dacorum. Any growth needs to be supported by the appropriate community services and facilities.”

To increase the population by 50% we would need a new community hall and a new doctor’s surgery. The current surgery is already struggling to cope with the present population without including the new residents of the 250 houses currently being built on LA5 and there was no provision for doctor’s surgery in that plan either. Where are they on the plan?

You say you do not directly provide healthcare. We vote you [ the councillors] to protect and improve the environment where we live and that must surely include healthcare and community buildings. Even if you do not provide them you must have to make provision for where they would go on the plan but there is no mention of either.

Taking land out of the Green Belt to build 2731 new homes on top of what is already being built to the west of Tring is not “exceptional circumstances” and the present infrastructure will not be able to support it. You are taking away more of our green spaces which are vital to our wellbeing, as the last year has proved, and replacing it with more houses and more cars and pollution.

At a time when we are being encouraged to buy local food to cut down road miles and as a country to become more self-sufficient, post Brexit, why are you considering Dunsley Farm as an area to build houses. Where is that farm being relocated to?

Also the local museum is part of the history of Tring, which your report says is vital to preserve and is supported by many volunteers and the History Society for the people of Tring and the many visitors who come to our town, must be preserved and left in the centre of the town. If the old cattle market area is built on what happens to the farmer’s market? Losing that facility is losing the identity of Tring as a market town. King Edward 11 granted Tring market town status in the early 14th century and you risk losing that history for no apparent reason.

As Tring was granted market town status by the King in the 14th century are you entitled to effectively take it away from the town?

Why should our contribution to this housing dilemma be the next largest after Hemel Hempstead? We have a smaller population than Berkhamsted and far fewer facilities and yet our housing share is greater. Where are all these new home buyers coming from and where are they going to work?

Why are Dacorum still basing the housing needs on the ONS of 2014, when there has been another ONS survey since which has reduced the housing needs from the previous figure,

The whole process should be halted until the plans can be seen properly in public and a face-to-face discussion with our councillors held. The residents of Dacorum deserve nothing less than this.

The whole plan needs to go back to the drawing board and be reassess

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4497
<b>Person ID</b>	1264403
<b>Full Name</b>	Jake Latham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>A significant increase of traffic and a clear lack of consideration for improvement of road infrastructure</b></p> <p>I live around the Ickneild way/Bulbourne road in tring [ADDRESS REMOVED]. Already we have vast amounts of traffic passing our house and almost all times of the day, not just residential traffic, however also commercial and industrial traffic, particularly for the Ickneild Way industrial estate, however also from the Heygates Flour Mill.</p> <p>An increase of traffic will not only cause travel delays, however will also mean more vehicles are stationary on the roads, massively increasing both air pollution and noise pollution. This will have a significant negative impact on my family and neighbour's health, in a country where we are striving to reduce air and noise pollution.</p> <p>The A41 carriageway is already at maximum capacity, with average que times to join the A41 during rush hour as long as 30 minutes.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4537
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4587
<b>Person ID</b>	1145918
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Tregoning
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This part of the plan is fundamentally flawed. There is no proven need for 2,730 dwellings.</p> <p>There is no logic for a 55% growth in Tring based on an abandoned algorithm.</p> <p>No recognition is made of the effect of Brexit (1 million fewer residents in the UK, the Government withdrawal of imposed targets, The Governments desire to focus growth by levelling up to the Northand reducing South East Growth.</p> <p>The plan is fundamentally flawed and needs to be re-issued when constructive comment on specific growth of sites can be made</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4638
<b>Person ID</b>	1264483
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter and Miriam Yarrien

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Provision for Schooling:</b> The Plan indicates the need for 2 new primary schools and a new secondary school in Tring, (based on the 2014 Housing Projections). This suggests a huge additional requirement for teaching staff that need to be attracted to the area. I am concerned that these resources are available nationally and that they can be attracted to move and live in the Tring area. Whilst I am aware that DBC are not responsible for resourcing teaching staff, schools do not function without them which would clearly lead to a failure to deliver the facility, therefore what steps has DBC taken to ensure their availability in a timely manner to support the new schools?</p> <p><b>Provision for Health Care Services:</b> The Tring Delivery Strategy makes no mention of provision for facilities for community health care such as doctors and dental surgeries. With an estimated increase of population of approximately 6,000 to be expected, based on current Plan target houses there should be purpose built facilities to deal with the increased requirement. The existing facilities will not support such an increase. The “Healthy Communities” section does deal with the process of provision, but without the reservation of the space for such specialist building this could easily be overlooked and added as an afterthought in compromised circumstances, not to mention resourcing the staffing of the facilities.</p> <p><b>Sporting facilities:</b> To the West of Tring on Cow Lane there are Football, Netball, Rugby, Squash and Bowls Clubs, but these facilities lack adequate parking space and Cow Lane is at training and fixture times extremely congested leading to footpaths being impassable and the road congested to through traffic. This needs addressing with appropriate facilities on the Dunsley Road proposal opposite the sporting facilities (Map 44).</p> <p>The community swimming pool is a part of the Tring School sporting facilities and is therefore out of bounds during term time school hours and restricted at other times particularly with swimming clubs and canoe clubs block bookings. How will DBC make such facilities more available in the future?</p> <p><b>Tring Station:</b> It is probable that of the new residents at least 10% will be commuting using the station which suggests that 100 - 200 additional parking spaces will be required at the station. Since the recently built multi storey car park at the station is, in pre-Covid times almost full during weekdays there will be a need to expand further. What is in place to ensure that this additional requirement is available, it cannot be assumed that a bus service will be used by the majority of commuters?</p> <p><b>Potable Water:</b> All of the potable water in the area is currently extracted from rivers and aquifers and the amount that can be extracted is finite in order to maintain the health of those rivers and aquifers. The draft Dacorum Infrastructure Deliver Plan (2020-2038) does not appear to specifically address any Thames Water response to how potable water will</p>

be delivered to meet the increased demand. The Thames Water document “Water Resources Management Plan (2020 - 2100)” would suggest that a potable water supply for large development projects cannot be taken for granted and may well limit the building schedule in the area until new resource are developed by or after 2030. How does DBC intend to ensure that adequate potable water is available and aligned with the building schedule?

**Waste Water:** The draft Dacorum Infrastructure Deliver Plan (2020-2038) gives over a single paragraph to Tring Waste Water requirements, making the observation that the current network capacity will probably be inadequate and require upgrading. The responsibility is passed to the developer. Thames Water are still in the process of developing their Drainage and Waste Management Plan, which will not be completed in consultation form until summer 2022, but there is no reference by DBC in the Plan that there has been any liaison with Thames Water to achieve any sort of understanding regarding the system capacity for the planned number of additional housing and other facilities in Tring. What is DBC’s plan in this respect?

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4651

**Person ID** 1264487

**Full Name** Mrs Sue Edmanson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Q4 In addition to concern over destruction of the Green Belt, there are concerns re sustainability of the massive new developments proposed in Tring. A better understanding of allocation of social and affordable housing in TR02/TR03 is sought and assurances of property prices reflecting local salaries in order for local people to be able to stay in the area. One and two bedroom properties are needed but such homes also need to be accessible to the town centre and public transport.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4653

<b>Person ID</b>	1264487
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sue Edmanson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Q5 TO6 (Cattle market) concerns re proposal for a medium to large supermarket – where is the evidence for the need for this? Concern re. lack of specifics regarding the re-allocation of the Tring Museum which was build and reflects the heritage of Tring town centre. Brook Street is a very congested area at certain times and the addition of access to shops, parking, food and drinks venues, as well as housing will create even more of a bottle neck and a risk to safety. TR 01 already has industry and the potential to expand to create small units.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4683
<b>Person ID</b>	1145431
<b>Full Name</b>	mr David van Rhee
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4722

**Person ID** 1264507

**Full Name** CHRIS AND DAVE FOSTER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** If this disproportionate development goes ahead it will ruin Tring forever.

" YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU'VE GOT TILL ITS GONE

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4753

**Person ID** 1264512

**Full Name** THELMA FISHER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I have lived in in Tring all my life and have just reached 70. I love the town and especially the way that you can quickly walk into the countryside from most areas at present. I understand from the Local Plan and current publicity that large areas are designated to be used for planned housing.

I know that homes are needed but in the current situation it is unclear how many existing buildings may be empty and could also possibly be used for homes.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4771

**Person ID** 1253595

**Full Name** Ian Lindsey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My main comment is that the proposal to build 3000 new houses on green belt land near to Tring is stupid. The Director of Planning should be fired for making such a silly proposal. this will lead to a 55% in the number of houses in Tring which will change the very character of Tring and destroy its cultural heritage.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4803
<b>Person ID</b>	1264523
<b>Full Name</b>	KIRSTEEN AND PAUL CACCHIOLI
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We write to express our extreme concern and disappointment about the proposed Dacorum plan which will see a 55% increase in housing/population in Tring.</p> <p>Whilst we are not adverse to growth in Tring, and actually believe it is needed to keep the town and its shops thriving, a growth of this magnitude is simply unsupportable. The infrastructure is not set up to support growth of this size, with the high street, parking and the train station (both parking and train services) absolutely insufficient and inadequate for such a massive growth in population and traffic.</p> <p>Additionally, the development of green belt land is surely completely against the current environmental drive to maintain healthy, open plan areas where wildlife can thrive and where we can try and maintain some kind of balance between humans and the natural world we live in.</p> <p>Please register this email as an objection to the proposed development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS4831
<b>Person ID</b>	1264530
<b>Full Name</b>	BRENDA AND ROY HURLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>These are our general points of worries looking at the plans for Tring's future.</p> <p>General overdevelopment, to double the size of this old market market would destroy It's uniqueness. It's size has grown hugely in the 40 years we have lived here.</p> <p>No extra schools, doctors surgeries, policing have been built to support its growth.</p> <p>Along with the lack of infrastructure, the Victorian drainage system cannot take More new builds . Where is the plan for major new drains.</p> <p>Traffic that now use the town are constantly churning up the roads, pot holes never seem to be mended, nor last long when they do.</p> <p>Cow Lane that used to be a quiet road on the edge of Tring is now rat run for heavy traffic from the A41. The lorries don't obey the speed limits and it is only a question of time before someone either on cow Lane or station road is injured or killed by the heavy traffic that fly on them.</p> <p>Support for the farms that have worked here for the benefit of local people for a 100 years. We should not take their livelihood away.</p> <p>And lastly we need green fields, the green belt. At the rate of growth you are planning Our small towns will all be joined from Hemel Hempstead to Aylesbury. History , culture, And uniqueness will be lost.</p> <p>The plans are just too large for Tring to absorb these changes without changing it for the worst.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4838
<b>Person ID</b>	1264531
<b>Full Name</b>	PAUL KENT

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4870

<b>Person ID</b>	1264533
<b>Full Name</b>	MAURICE OKEEFFE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4890
<b>Person ID</b>	1150594
<b>Full Name</b>	Catherine and Mark Richardson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, We object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework.</p> <p>The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. We strongly object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p>

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4903

**Person ID** 1264536

**Full Name** Mr George Harvey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4907

**Person ID** 1264537

**Full Name** KATHERINE COURTNEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4925

**Person ID** 1264540

**Full Name** JOSEPH DAWSON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive



harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4935
<b>Person ID</b>	1260771
<b>Full Name</b>	JAMIE BELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided</p>

substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4949

**Person ID** 1264546

**Full Name** Dr Calvin Veeroo

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4975

**Person ID** 1264548

**Full Name** Mrs Sasha Godfrey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4993

**Person ID** 1264549

**Full Name** Mrs Kate Carter

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5073
<b>Person ID</b>	1264258
<b>Full Name</b>	Fintan FitzPatrick
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Included in Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5105
<b>Person ID</b>	1264571
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Trish Dowden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Comments on proposed development of Tring</p> <p>High level objection is the building on Greenbelt land without seeming to take into account brownfield or other sites that could be used. Also the number of houses seems to be above and beyond what our town needs.</p> <p>Tring is a market town with a lot of history, proposals for specific sites do not seem to take into account that history. The Auction Rooms are a big attraction and have featured regularly on television. We are a town built on Rothschild plans with very distinctive housing and a wonderful character and feel to our High Street which I fear is not being taken into account and will be lost.</p> <p>Warehousing just over the border (Tring is very close to Buckinghamshire) is not full so is there really a need for a lot more warehousing in Tring?</p> <p>More people are now using the walkways and woodlands/ green belt areas around Tring due to Government encouragement to get out and exercise more and due to the lockdown. Both of these situations are not going to change in the coming years. By taking away Green Belt land and paths and increasing the number of houses by over 50% this is only going to cause more congestion and deterioration of the paths in future. We seem to be having our green spaces /clean air spaces taken away but further air pollution is being added by this plan. How does this help the existing residents - in fact are the existing residents even considered in the plan?</p> <p>I worry that existing developments we have seen locally are about money rather than sustainability / wildlife or people. Trees that are supposedly protected are destroyed and paltry fines are given to huge development companies which don't even impact their petty cash! How can this be rectified in future and how can we be sure developers will adhere to plans!</p> <p>Has consideration been made for developing new urban developments with full infrastructure rather than adding to existing historical towns. Under 9% of England is built on so there is a lot of space out there!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5138
<b>Person ID</b>	1263960

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Tim Amsden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Tring & District Local History & Museum Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I object fundamentally to SP23. I do not accept that Tring is capable of absorbing rapid change to this extent without drastic loss of character as a community which has evolved over centuries. Tring is evidently regarded by DBC merely as an area of land on which to park the houses it wants. It has no understanding whatever of its history, people and traditions, evidenced by the reference to Tring Park as being no more than 'an important green infrastructure asset.' The housing need that exists in Tring is but a fraction of the total number of houses here proposed, meaning that the new residents would have no connection to it, or interest in it. It is observed that no neighbourhood plan is in place, and without such a plan, this strategy should be withdrawn and wholly reconsidered.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5162
<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5234
<b>Person ID</b>	1264608
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Beadle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5300
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5500
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This proposal is inappropriate in scale given the limited public transport infrastructure available. Parking at the railway station is limited and at capacity. The bus routes do not serve the outlying communities and are served by dated environmentally inefficient vehicles. The existing green areas are needed to accommodate the effects of climate change. Tring is at end of the borough and generally poorly served. GP surgeries are full, there are no banks, there are empty retail/commercial units in the town. The high street pavement is deteriorating again and isn't capable of accommodating the current traffic level without increasing the local population further. Tring is a relatively small rural town with limited social infrastructure. The societal changes brought about in the wake of Covid 19 invalidate the current plans and cause them to demand reinvestigation.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5519
<b>Person ID</b>	1264048
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Housing must not be high density and all houses should have a decent garden. The new estates must have decent sized parks and green corridors. I would also question that that many homes are going to be needed in Tring (Brexit and Covid, more people working from home may mean people can live in less expensive parts of the country and won't want to move to Dacorum).
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5561
<b>Person ID</b>	1264491
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5646
<b>Person ID</b>	1264689
<b>Full Name</b>	Philip Hobden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The UK only produces about 50% of its food requirements and hence is a security risk in the event of a pandemic affecting food supplies. Where land is being used or can be used for agricultural purposes this should not be used for building except in exceptional circumstances.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5689
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	dacorum is proposing to take the rural character out of tring by pushing development boundaries to the main arterial route of the A41 not allowing a sufficient wildlife corridor of buffer against traffic noise and aire pollution. It will change the character of tring into an urban built up environment which will not in any way make it a great place to live. How is this carefully managed and sustainable as stated in 23.139?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5711
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The italicised text above incorrectly refers to Berkhamsted; it should read Tring Delivery Strategy.</p> <p>23.144 - 23.147. Despite the assertion of the separating powers of the railway and Grand Union canal, the Plan does not adequately recognise the impact of the Tring East development upon the neighbouring Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Area of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>In failing to recognise such impact, the Plan does not address its contradiction of sustaining existing open spaces and the preservation of natural habitats. In particular, approximately 1400 dwellings with an average occupancy of three persons means an additional 4200 people will impact the wider environment and countryside and the provision of services. Much more publicly available detail about this aspect of the Plan should be prepared before the Plan is considered further.</p> <p>23.151 - 23.158. The proposed significant developments to the east and south east of Tring will be unsustainable in the absence of adequate infrastructure being provided before development takes place. In particular, transport needs of the town are not currently being met. Roads are congested and town centre users (pedestrian and vehicle) frequently have to negotiate or are held up by large delivery vehicles blocking the High Street. This situation will worsen given the size of the proposed developments and population increase.</p> <p>The focus of the Plan is about meeting Dacorum's needs; the Plan makes no mention, nor does it take account of people and transport coming to Tring from further field. Tring town centre is the nearest retail centre to Aston Clinton; Wendover is further away. With the proposed developments in neighbouring Buckinghamshire, an even greater demand will be placed upon Tring, potential economic benefits notwithstanding. Similarly, Tring station welcomes travellers from neighbouring Buckinghamshire but the Plan makes no mention of the demands this makes of the road network and parking. Evidence of DBC liaising effectively with Buckinghamshire authorities about the impact of that county's developments upon Tring and elsewhere in Dacorum should be made publicly available.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5748
<b>Person ID</b>	1264054
<b>Full Name</b>	EMMA CAVE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Tring Youth Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264052
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	EMMA CAVE
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5909
<b>Person ID</b>	1264752
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5959
<b>Person ID</b>	1264792
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Gray

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>An additional 2731 houses in Tring is excessive and will change the character of the town massively. Most will agree that we should take our fair share of necessary additional development but these proposals will increase the town population by more than 50%. This could hardly be seen as reasonable or "fair".</p> <p>In addition, any "affordable" housing included must be truly affordable to those wishing to get their foot on the ladder for the first time. This does not mean £600k houses reduced to £500k. Or £2.5k per month rentals reduced to £2k</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5971
<b>Person ID</b>	1151388
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Aileen MCVEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within</p>

Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5998

**Person ID** 1264813

**Full Name** ALISON PAGE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I object to the proposed plan on a number of grounds:

- 1 Green Belt needs to be protected. It is classified as Green Belt for a very good reason. This area should remain untouched and instead the housing should utilise brownfield sites and conversion in existing urban areas. There are plenty of empty properties, offices, derelicts which should be used first and only then a new proposal made subject to review.
- 2 The proposed number of houses being built in Tring is disproportionate to the whole.

- 3 Extreme effort should be made to protect our market towns, such as Tring and Berkhamsted, to retain their character, their beauty and their appeal for future generations. The proposal will demolish that character and beauty and once it has gone, it will be impossible to get back. Current generations need to be far more aware of their far-reaching actions.
- 4 The environment will naturally be impacted by such a large volume of houses, how will this be mitigated?
- 5 The proposal focuses too much on profit for the builders and not enough on public and environmental interest.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6000

**Person ID** 1264809

**Full Name** Sue Selfe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.



The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6001

**Person ID** 404019

**Full Name** Mrs Jean McDonnell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I feel the Dacorum local plan for Tring is totally unsuitable for the following reasons:

It is far too large for the area

There is insufficient infrastructure. Doctors practices are overfull now making it difficult to get appointments even without the extra requirements there will be due to current building.

Schools are also very oversubscribed.

Parking in the town, in normal circumstances, is insufficient. Most houses will generate two extra cars. Parking in private roads is a big problem & daytime parking on grass verges, particularly at school pick up times, is a real hazard.

If extra houses are built more green belt land is required not less & more recreation areas not less.

Keep this an area of natural beauty by building only an appropriate number of houses.  
Infrastructure needs to come first.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6019

**Person ID** 1264750

**Full Name** Neil Joyce

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

23.135 Tring is not a market town. It is a thriving, historic town with a strong community spirit.

23.139 Please ensure that it is indeed carefully managed because the local road structure is already nearing capacity.

23.142 The amount of proposed new housing will significantly change both the appearance and character of the town. Brownfield sites should be prioritised over encroachment into greenbelt.

23.143 I oppose all of these proposed sites because of their impact both visually and environmentally.

23.144 The new neighbourhood off Station Road is on arable farmland with a history of flooding. The visual impact from the hills that surround the town will be great. The wildlife corridor along Marshcroft Lane is insufficient to replace the ancient hedge boundaries and drainage system.

23.145 Dunsley Farm is an important and visually appealing approach to the town. It supports small independent companies that would be left to find alternative, and less attractive sites. I would recommend that any business hub is reconsidered due to the proximity of potential sites at Castlemead, Pitstone.

23.147 The need for primary and secondary schools emphasises the fact that this is a large development for a town of this size - basically increasing the primary capacity by 60% and doubling the secondary school size in the town.

The long distance views will be lost, as anyone who has walked in the local area can attest to. This is a massive increase in the town size. Consideration should be made to the extensive housing developments in Aylesbury and Pitstone which, due to their flatter terrain, have less impact to the eye.

23.150 Tr06 would be self-defeating because a supermarket would take some of the available car parking. Also it would destroy the historic cattle market open space and museum building.

23.151, 154, 157 Although I personally agree that Tring is easily accessible on foot or bicycle, my observations are that the majority of local trips are by car. I don't see that changing with increased, and more widely spread developments.

23.156 A link road would bisect the very quiet and rural Marshcroft Lane, and also impact wildlife who rely on open fields and the ease of access to the canal.

23.158 The pandemic has massively reduced the demand for train travel. I think that this section needs to be reviewed in light of this sudden shift in work patterns.

All of the proposed development sites (Tr01-Tr06) are out of character with the current town.

Table 39 - Retail and Leisure should first consider how to encourage businesses to use the vacant premises in the High Street before building further properties.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6051

**Person ID** 1264824

**Full Name** Anne Pattinson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Points 23.135 and 23.136 indicate why Tring should not suffer a 50% growth in housing provision.

23.146 indicates that there will be 'local facilities' in place for the strategic sites. This suggests that additional facilities will be on a small scale and not able to cope with the 50% increase in housing that Tring will need to accommodate.

23.150 A new foodstore on this site is completely impractical. Simply consider the traffic build up along Brook Street when the High Street was closed for over 9 months. During this time there were frequent traffic jams because vehicles could simply not pass each other. If 50% more people need to access the facilities, then that is 50% more traffic (and it will be primarily car traffic as the majority of the developments will be too far away to walk).

23.152 'Tring does not suffer significant problems' with its current population. Those 'congestion points' will remain, be exacerbated and added to with 50% more use. The results...frustration, time wasted, pollution, noise...

'A long period of time' is a phrase used on many occasions. It is used in reference to the time taken for the new developments to be in place. 2038 is not a terribly long way away and a 50% growth of the town is out of sync with anything else planned across the borough.

Suitable Alternative Greenspace - don't develop on so much greenfield land and the town will remain green and open and a picturesque part of the Chilterns.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6057

**Person ID** 1263050

**Full Name** Nichola Hickey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I consider that a 55% increase in housing in Tring as overdevelopment and will have an effect on all existing infrastructures and resources.

It will affect many different areas in particular:

- Traffic
- Healthcare resources - we are struggling now with Doctors' appointments at the surgeries!
- Tring station - access and parking availability. Street lights need to be put on the dark lonely road to the station together with drainage! it is totally unsafe for lone females in the dark! Better pavement and surface for pedestrians and cyclists - it is so dangerous!
- Addition of pedestrian crossings to the town
- Schools - they are oversubscribed now. Where are the children going to go?

- Parking near schools - where as these houses are away from the main town?
- Who is the housing for - Affordable housing for youngsters trying to get on the ladder? What is the mix?
- Local community will be spoilt as Tring is a lovely small town.
- Impact on Wildlife/areas of outstanding beauty - hedgerows and trees
- Air quality affected
- Green spaces in Tring disappearing
- Local parks and parking
- No banks
- Post office that seems to open when it feels like it

Tring doesn't have the capacity to deal with a 55% increase in housing and will totally ruin our lovely market town. It is a small town for a reason!

If we wanted to live in a large town we would have chosen to live in Aylesbury or Hemel Hempstead.

#### Included files

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6059

**Person ID** 1264846

**Full Name** ROSEMARY ASHFIELD

#### Organisation Details

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

#### Tring Delivery Strategy comment

My husband and I have viewed with horror Dacorum's Local Plan for housing development on green belt land to the east of Tring for 2731 houses in Grove Fields and even more development on the site of the present fire station, auction rooms and museum in Brook Street. This comes on top of the Roman Park development currently being built on green belt land to the west of Tring consisting of approximately 200 dwellings. Houses for sale are in the £600,000 to £800,000 price range with no sign yet of the 40% affordable housing required on a site of this size.

The next proposed development in Brook Street involves the demolition of the fire-station, auction rooms, lower part of the market car park and "re-location" to a site, as yet unspecified, of the Tring museum. This museum was part funded

by a lottery grant and public donations and provides a vital link with Tring's charter as a market town granted many centuries ago. It stands in an historic location, next to where the old cattle market once stood, with easy access and parking and is a valuable asset for both tourism and local schools.

More development has been applied for in two former historic bank buildings in Tring High Street which more latterly housed "Restaurant 23" and "Lussmans" after the banks closed down. Both of these restaurants closed in the pandemic. Plans for number 20 (ref 20/03858/LBC) are for 3x 2 bed-roomed flats, conversion of strong room to a 1 bed dwelling and a 2 bed dwelling in grounds to the rear. Plans for 23a (20/02977) are for change of use to 3 ground floor offices and 2x2 bed-roomed flats. Plans for 23b (ref20/2978/LBC) are for 3 new 2 bed-roomed mews houses. My question is where is the parking for these proposed new developments as they have little rear access?

Other developments have taken place in the historic heart of Tring – 12 dwellings in Dunedin Court off Akeman Street on what was the site of small workshops and more houses off Langdon Street on the site of a haulage yard. More houses off Aylesbury Road on the site of the old Francis House School. Three mansions have appeared facing the Miswell Lane Recreation grounds on what used to be Osmington School playing fields. On Bulbourne Road four more palatial dwellings on fields next to Gannel Farm and on Station Road the demolition of the old health centre and nurse's accommodation allows still more housing in Nightingale Court.

Beaconsfield Road was a pleasant mixed development of mostly 1930's detached houses, semis and bungalows. Sadly every detached house or bungalow which comes onto the market is demolished and two more take their place. The last two 5 bed-roomed properties were marketed in excess of £800,000. and a planning application is currently in place for the demolition of number 55 and the erection of 2 semi-detached. These houses are largely not affordable for the lower paid and reduce the housing stock of bungalows to meet the needs of the elderly. I would like to know if houses constructed in Tring, or given planning permission during 2020, are to be deducted from the required number of new dwellings?

Moving on to the demolition of two farms on the A41 to provide yet more housing, a potential school and new employment, it is hard to see how making farmers redundant can benefit the rural economy. Likewise the new road planned between Station Road and Bulbourne Road together with the vast number of houses planned for Grove Fields will further decimate the green belt and the wildlife which flourishes on the chalk down-land. Currently some of these fields are flooded so how are Dacorum proposing to "reduce flood risk and flooding issues?" Has a geological survey been carried out in this area?

Tring clearly needs more affordable housing for our key-workers and the lower paid who cannot afford to buy or rent in the town but not more of the high end properties which are currently being built. The infrastructure of the town is inadequate to cope with such a huge increase in the population and we see no Delivery Plan of what is needed. By playing an

“enabling role” over the past years Dacorum have reduced such facilities across the board. Changes have been as follows:

#### Fire, Police and Medical Services

Planned demolition of the existing fire station which has served Tring well for many years.

The police station is closed and we have only one policeman and two community officers.

Health Services: The Health Centre which used to provide excellent pre and post natal care, classes for expectant mums, inoculations and child development, sight and hearing tests has long been closed and the land sold for building.

Doctor’s surgeries: We have two surgeries, both administered by Rothschild House with inadequate parking and only one disabled parking bay each. These surgeries also serve the surrounding villages. It is extremely difficult to get an appointment and you will rarely be seen face to face, waiting instead for a telephone consultation. Home visits have long since disappeared.

Hospitals: We have an Urgent Care Drop-In Centre in Hemel Hempstead ( not open all night) otherwise you will need to travel to Watford, St. Albans or Stevenage.

Rehabilitation and respite care: The excellent unit in Northchurch which enabled patients discharged from hospital to receive care and physiotherapy before returning home was closed some years ago. Hemel Hempstead hospital does have limited facilities, mostly for palliative care and local nursing homes have few beds allocated to the NHS. or Social Services for respite care.

#### Leisure Facilities

Tring is blessed with clubs run by local organisations such as the Bowls Club, Cricket Club, Squash Club, Tennis Club etc. and excellent football clubs. What it lacks however is a leisure centre with swimming and gymn facilities at reasonable cost. At present we can only use Tring School’s pool out of school hours along with their astro-turf pitch. There is a long wait for children’s swimming lessons and most parents will have to travel to neighbouring towns. Likewise private gymn

subscriptions are often beyond the reach of the lower paid. We also have few exercise classes for the elderly to keep fit.

There is an excellent library in Tring which sadly has had opening hours reduced over recent years. Judging by the numerous surveys conducted on Library use this too could be at risk of closure and is the only place which offers internet access and guidance for those who do not have an internet connection at home.

### Retail

Dacorum has done little to protect our High Street which presents a depressing picture of closed shops, restaurants and banks. There are no banks in Tring, only one small post-office and one even smaller building society. During the pandemic the queues for both stretched the length of the High Street. We have a large elderly population many of whom are unfamiliar with internet banking and ATM machines.

### Climate Change

Tring's Refuse and Re-Cycling Centre was closed by Dacorum some years ago when we were told we had permission to dispose of our rubbish at the Aston Clinton Centre. I understand this permission has been restricted to those who can provide documentation that they live in Bucks. Our nearest centre is in Berkhamsted which is small and only open part-time. This inevitably leads to more fly-tipping.

To provide for the expected growth in electric vehicles Dacorum has installed a very few charging points in the Market Car park, Tesco have done rather better in this respect. With regard to renewable energy I have not yet noticed any solar panels being installed on the houses under construction on Roman Park for which Dacorum granted planning permission.

Thames Water have recently contacted Tring residents with regard to the problems they are having in maintaining supply and water pressure at peak times due to increased development in both Tring and Aston Clinton. They have offered advice on a number of water saving devices. In view of this and the variation in weather due to climate change have Dacorum ascertained that water supplies are sufficient?

### Sustainable Transport and Connectivity



In reply to a query with regard to parking places in Tring during a planning consultation meeting for the Roman Park development we were told that a cycle path would be provided to the town and there was a regular bus service to meet the needs of residents. The 500 bus service is far from reliable being delayed on route between Watford or Aylesbury and ceases altogether after 19.00 hours. There is a limited service on Saturday and no buses at all on Sunday.

You may also not be aware that Tring Railway station is two miles outside the town with very few buses and a cycle lane which is so poorly maintained, badly lit and dangerous with wet leaves, cyclists rarely use it. Parking at the station is also very expensive.

### Education

Tring has three excellent infant and junior schools and Tring Secondary School (currently undergoing re-construction) all of which have a good reputation. Tring School also serves the local villages and is often oversubscribed meaning pupils do not get the school of their choice and have to make long bus journeys to other schools. I note that you have included possible school building on your development plan but how long will this take? The Roman Park development is going on sale now.

Tring has three private nurseries but none operated by the local authority. Akeman Street Baptist church offers excellent pre-school education but only has limited capacity. More development means more young families with fewer facilities available to them.

### Elderly Care

We have only one privately run Nursing Home in Tring and three sheltered housing complexes. To live in the sheltered housing residents must be reasonably fit able to fund themselves. Only one of the complexes has a resident manager. The other two have a visiting manager who has responsibility for more than one complex. During the pandemic with community halls closed and visitors discouraged, residents have become extremely isolated and rely heavily on visits from Age UK and telephone calls and visits outside from church volunteers.

We have no day care centre in Tring and the luncheon club has long gone. Meals on wheels are no longer delivered by local volunteers but cooked in bulk and brought by van from Hemel Hempstead. Trings local churches offer lunches or tea and cake on a weekly basis or otherwise the elderly have no opportunity to leave their homes and socialize with others. Obviously this has not been able to take place during the pandemic.

Many of the elderly would benefit from advice and assistance in how to claim Pension Credit, Carer's Allowance, Income Support etc. Sadly the Citizen's Advice Bureau has closed and the excellent Finance Advisors from the County were made redundant several years ago. Claims must be made on lengthy forms and verified with a one hour telephone conversation. Although Age UK assist where they can this process is completely beyond the ability of many pensioners and their entitlements go unclaimed.

Dacorum has failed to deliver on their strategy of "liaising with providers to ensure that appropriate provision is made" with regard to the infrastructure provided in Tring. If the infrastructure is failing now it can only get worse with massive new developments. May I suggest that Dacorum take the opportunity of studying the 2021 census due to take place in March to inform their future plans for Tring.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS6076

**Person ID**

1264850

**Full Name**

LES WICKS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Having read the consultation documents related to Tring I believe the report authors have done their best to bury the full extent of the changes planned for Tring - The plan for Tring is incoherent based on the massive growth in housing of 55%, it is inconceivable that any town could accommodate such a rapid increase in population, the damage to the area would not be recoverable and will change the essential character of the town that exists today. The area seems to be disproportionately affected, when compared with other areas across the UK, no explanation is given on how the methodology for determining Dacorum's, Tring's, target.

The plan for new infrastructure is weak and points only to major arteries not to local roads and transport links - local infrastructure is weak now the issues will be much worse if the plans for the area from Station Road to Bulbourne is

allowed to go ahead without amendment. The plan to improve local employment is at best inconsistent with the growth in number that will live in Tring and at worst makes no attempt at building high value jobs.

The approach to wellbeing and exercise is inadequate and fails to take account of the increase in the local population and the age profile of the area - it is quite ridiculous that a town of the size proposed does not have its own sports centre will full size swimming pool, with more indoor courts, and more all-weather outdoor facilities. The plan for walking, cycling and other increasingly popular pastimes is vague at best. We have extensive chalk quarries in the area no plan is made to promote outdoor activities like sailing/ water sports or of increasing use of wildlife areas.

This plan, as presented, should be allowed to go forward without further consultation on a more substantiated plan – I hope we can look forward to your support in determining a better, more equitable, more coherent plan for local communities in this area.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6086

**Person ID** 1262182

**Full Name** Steve Webb

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I have read the document posted on the Dacorum Planning website. I wish to put on record my feedback which, if possible, I would like to see posted on the relevant part of the website.

- 1 There are fundamental, conflicting and irreconcilable issues with this Plan. The dictats of Central Government are to a large extent responsible for this in no small measure but I'm still surprised that Docorum Borough Council would proceed with no absolutely no acknowledgement of this obvious fact. In various parts of the report, mentions are made of the importance of attractive landscapes, the climate change emergency, the desirability of sustainable development, countryside representing the least sustainable option, a rich historic heritage etc etc. It is palpably clear that these cannot be reconciled in a plan like this and it is frankly unwise to present it as a plausible set of proposals in such a context.

- 1 The potential scale of development right across Dacorum is quite clearly excessive and disproportionate. There is a housing need; everyone recognises that - we all want our children and lower paid key workers to have access to affordable housing and it is obvious that people need to live somewhere but increasing the size of a small country town like Tring, for example, by 50% cannot possibly be the answer. Planning policy should not be responsible for settlements coalescing in an already congested area of the country. Tring and Tring Station, for instance, will become one partly at the expense of re-designating Green Belt. This simply cannot be justified under any kind of rational analysis - and certainly not one that purports to have long term sustainability at its heart. The scale of development needs to be far more measured than this to avoid existing communities being completely overwhelmed.
  
- 1 This Plan should be reviewed wholesale in the context of the massive structural changes being brought about by both the rise of the Internet and the impact of Covid 19. For example, large sections of Hemel Hempstead town centre are being hollowed out by the changes to property use - in retail, in commercial property, in car parking and a host of other areas. Not all of these changes are bad but they are profound and they need to be properly taken account of in land use planning. Instead of tearing up green fields in sensitive areas, why doesn't the Council take a strategic view, rather than the incremental approach in this Plan? It should consider repurposing large areas of developed land using its compulsory purchase powers. Empty shops, offices etc would be better being demolished and replaced with high density, comparatively low cost residential property. Instead of providing a developers charter to build homes on green belt which those most in need of housing cannot afford, why not build large numbers of homes where they can and should be built as part of revitalising town centres. Dacorum could and should be at the forefront of a move which will inevitably gather pace in the months and years ahead across the U.K. - the current shape of this plan is woefully short of what a more imaginative and relevant approach might deliver.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6118
<b>Person ID</b>	1264855
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanna LARKINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
<b>* Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am opposing the draft local plan with two key objectives - to reduce the absolute number of houses to be built in Tring and to propose that the only green belt to be built on, <i>should green belt be required</i> , is the land between Cow Lane and London Road.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6162
<b>Person ID</b>	398747
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lindsay Hardy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Dacorum Local Plan 2020 - 2038 - Key Development Tring</p> <p>I am writing in response to your proposals for Tring in your Dacorum Local Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Your proposal to build over 2700 new homes in Tring is not compliant with the core of the NPPF guidance for "sustainable development" apparently an objective of the plan. So makes little sense. Across your Dacorum Plan the planned development of Tring is, proportionately, by far the largest urban growth outlined and is in a location that is arguably least well suited for it.</li> <li>In your plan for Tring point 23.150 you state that there is "no requirement for significant new non-food floorspace in the town. On what basis do you conclude this when you are proposing to more than double the number of houses in the town?</li> </ol> <p>Under the same point you state that there will need to be another food store and your "preference is for a new foodstore to be located within the existing town centre. We are exploring the feasibility of this through a site on High Street / Brook Street". You already recognise there will be delivery issues. By doubling the size of the town and the increase in traffic through narrow roads decided that a foodstore would be built at Dunsley farm site. It is disingenuous of you to put</p>

forward the suggestion of a centrally located foodstore that is not practicable. You will therefore have two supermarkets at the entrance to the town very definitely changing the character of this small market town.

- 1 Your points under 23.151 talk of 'a compact market town, most residential areas of Tring are easily accessible to the town centre by foot or bicycle'. Your proposals are destroying 'a compact market town'. There will be no 'compact market town'. And to add to this who goes shopping on a bicycle?? It is disingenuous to write your planning proposal using such terms, or, the plan is from the outset not fit for purpose.
- 1 Point 23.152 speaks further to this. You state that "With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street, due to inter urban commuting patterns, Tring does not suffer significant problems as the road network across town is fairly permeable".

Why, when it is already known that Brook Street is an area of congestion would you propose it as a site for the additional foodstore?? How could any planner, worth employing, imagine that, by more than doubling the number of households, schools, stores etc outlined in the plan, there will not be a considerable increase in traffic? And, that this will not lead to major congestion, when there is no possibility of expanding the road network in the town? This is not planning. These are just words in a document that have been ill thought through.

- 1 Your point 23.158 "There is the potential for an increased demand for car parking at Tring Station". This point in particular shows that you nor your planners have no knowledge or understanding of Tring and its surrounding area. There isn't a "potential demand" for more car parking at Tring station, there is an immediate demand for more parking now. Before the pandemic it was not possible to park at the station after 9.00am, resulting in residents having to drive to Berkhamsted or Hemel Hempstead to board a train. This is such a known issue that again it begs the question that you have any appreciation of Tring the town, the role it plays in servicing the local villages, or its geography, surrounded as it is by Buckinghamshire and how Tring has to interface with another county, its demands and planning authority.

I could go on, but hopefully others will cover more points raised in your document. Yes, you could call it a 'Strategy for Growth' as that is all it is. A building of 2,700 more households, more than double the number of existing households, is certainly growth. It is little more than that. The rest of the document is ill considered and gives no sense that your planners have had more than a cursory look at the town, sensed its history, heart or the role it and its amenities play in this small county peninsula.

I do not believe you understand or represent the current or future residents by this proposal.

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6178
<b>Person ID</b>	1264800
<b>Full Name</b>	Matt Pattinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>23.139</b> - Proposing a 55% increase in population over such a short time period is not what would be reasonably considered careful management. The nature of the town will be irrevocably changed significantly. A more moderate approach is required so that evolving and emerging demands from the increasing population can be addressed and the positive reasons for people choosing to live in Tring are maintained.</p> <p><b>Facilities</b></p> <p>There appears to be no provision for increased demand for medical, dental, early years or emergency services.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <p>There is no concrete commitment to sustainable development practices such as net zero carbon housing. There is no provision for allotments and appears to be a lack of open spaces incorporated into the development sites.</p> <p><b>Disproportionate development</b></p> <p>Tring appears to have an allocation that is more than double that of any other area based on percentage increase. The development requirements should be distributed more evenly across borough.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6230
<b>Person ID</b>	1264668
<b>Full Name</b>	Geraint Cooksley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Regarding Tring Delivery Strategy, the scale of new housing and the potential area affected in Tring is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – this equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land. The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p> <p>Tring town centre is constrained in size, with a congested high street and limited parking. An expansion of the scale proposed will cause gridlock in the town, as well as forcing most residents not in walking distance of the town centre to do their weekly shopping in larger retail units within access of the A41. This presents two problems - an increasing dependance on cars and resultant pollution and a contintued decline in the high street which has a large number of vacant buildings.</p> <p>I would urge that the plans be re-drafted to focus on smaller scale expansion with a greater emphasis on initiatives to enhance the town centre such as pedestrainisation and a community bus service to provide a more regular cirucular access route to the town centre.</p> <p>It is particularly worrying the incredible impact to the Chilterns and the AONB that so much housing will create to the natural environment and ecosystems. The creation of new developments should be translated into more protection of natural environment and its significant expansion to guarantee some environmental sustainability and decarbonisation.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6264
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6289
<b>Person ID</b>	1264772
<b>Full Name</b>	Adrian Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I agree with the view expressed by other local groups that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The proposals for Tr02 and Tr03 are excessive in scale for a development with a stated goal of being 'compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character' of a small market town. Considerations around supporting infrastructure (roads in particular) and mitigating Green Belt loss are insufficiently developed.</li> <li>2) NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces – there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key 'honey pots' of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.</li> <li>3) The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum requires developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and there is little to no evidence that this has been given meaningful consideration for Tring.</li> <li>4) Throughout the Plan there is confusion between what constitutes green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors and lack of explicit requirements around wildlife corridors, hedgerows and buffer zones (DBC Urban Nature Study maps; Tring. Herts Biological Records Centre 2005/6).</li> </ol>

5) The Plan must be more explicit on matters relating to Hertfordshire's Sustainability Strategy and the priorities defined by the HCCSP – in particular, there is a clear opportunity to mandate the highest possible standards for renewable energy use, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity.

6) There are too many caveats and vagueness of intent for a Plan proposing such significant impact on the character of the town and surroundings.

7) There is an absence of even approximate timelines for the proposed developments, by site.

**Detailed responses:**

**Section 23.139 'Introduction'**

There is no published infrastructure plan and personal experience suggests when this is left to developers to deliver it is often late and/or lacking.

**Section 23.143 'Tring Homes'**

A significant proportion of the future housing (around 2,200 dwellings) will be delivered as urban extensions through the release from the Green Belt of the following strategic sites: East of Tring (1,400 dwellings), New Mill (400 dwellings), Dunsley Farm (400 dwellings). However, densities on Tr01/Tr02/Tr03 are not stated despite seemingly being required by NPPF para 123b.

**Section 23.147 'Tring Homes – Key Objectives'**

There are no objectives around retaining and/or building on the distinctiveness of Tring especially given the sizable scale of growth proposed for Tring. This is counter to the vision / strategic objectives as mentioned above. The objectives are also not explicit enough about the importance of green/climate/environment issues.

Will we really need a further secondary school?

There are no commitments to maintaining local wildlife habitats despite the growth - as mentioned by others this is not the same as provision of green / leisure spaces. Linked to this the "translocation" of existing wildlife sites does not seem feasible without damage.

there appears to have been little thought regarding expanding the road infrastructure in Tring to accommodate the extra load. The comment '*secure the delivery of a local north-south distributor road between Bulbourne Road and London Road*' seems aspirational and does not account for other pinch points within Tring such as Brook Street, Cow Lane, Station Road/London Road junction and the Bulbourne Road/Icknield Way junction. The lack of mention/analysis of traffic from the north of Tring are a real concern. How can the plans proceed without more detail here?

**Section 23.149 'Tring Employment' (Page 235)**

Warehousing should be removed as an option and a modest maximum industrial building size established. This does not offer sensible employment prospects for Tring and will lead to greater heavy traffic and pollution. It also detracts from the distinctiveness of the town. Surely this would be better sited in one of the existing sites on the A41 and in conjunction with Aylesbury Vale District Council. Generally

I strongly object to the creation of an expanded industrial space for Dunsley Farm . This is unwarranted and again is likely to impact the distinctive nature of Tring town centre. Why isn't there a focus on expanding the existing larger industrial units at the west end of Tring or at Bulbourne? Also, I understand this goes back to 2017 when the proposed development of Tring was much smaller and are no longer fully valid or appropriate. A 5+hectare industrial estate at Dunsley Farm is likely to concentrate more traffic on a centre that will struggle to cope.

### **Section 23.150 'Tring Retail'**

There is no mention of how the plan will explicitly support new forms of public transport.

As mentioned previously I just do not understand how the recommendations for Tr06 and Tr01 meet the needs of the plan. They do not minimise the impact on Tring in terms of movement and do not help with enhancing the distinctiveness of Tring town.

- Traditional, food-oriented supermarket space on Tr06 no longer makes sense either in terms of scale or location (especially from an access and traffic standpoint).
- The alternative Tr01 proposal is also no longer appropriate – it is sub-optimal for developments in Tr02 and most of Tr03, inconveniently located and needlessly adding to traffic.

I agree with the thinking that this be reconsidered:

- Thought given to a site off Bulbourne Road, which would be more accessible from the proposed new developments, the north of Tring and the villages to the north of Tring.
- Regarding additional retail space in Tr06, Tring has a long history as a market town and significant success with the growth of the Farmers' Market. Modern social trends point to a clear opportunity for a permanent, modern, 'destination' food and leisure facility. This could be made more accessible from the High Street by moving the entrance/exit of the Forge Car Park to Brook Street and using that space for retail development instead.

### **Section 23.152 'Tring Movement'**

I think this section severely underestimates the likely congestion as a consequence of the proposed growth, '*With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street ...Tring does not suffer significant [traffic] problems*'.

The High Street is frequently congested with large tailbacks and this will be exacerbated with additional traffic especially with further centrally located supermarkets / industrial estates.

The Sustainable Transport Strategy does not appear to have projected the associated numbers and this cannot be a sensible way to move forward. This needs to truly understand the impact of additional traffic on Tring centre including parking and other such issues including the ability of the local rail infrastructure supporting the increased commuter load. Peak trains are already very busy and parking at Tring Station limited after 8am.

### **Policy SP23 – Delivering Growth in Tring**

As mentioned previously 'at least' 2731 dwellings appears to be untenable in the current plan especially as there is no timescale given for any of the numbers (overall or by site), and yet these must exist as the overall growth for Dacorum is profiled by year.

I would like to see the following changes:

- Tr01 – State any employment space is via small units or office space and a smaller number of residential dwellings to minimise impact on Tring centre.
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include reference to a supermarket and NOT still be considering multi-level developments including retail, office and/or housing – it is not in keeping with Tring's character, distracts from better use of the site and does not take into account the implications of Tr02/03 expansion.
- Tr02/03 expansion curtailed significantly for reasons mentioned previously.
- Impact on local utilities further developed especially in terms of energy and water – I believe that there will be a substantial impact on local water supplies with the proposed growth based on feedback from Thames Water.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6294
<b>Person ID</b>	1264903
<b>Full Name</b>	andrew wallis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am strongly opposed to the scale of development proposed in Tring. The character and identity of the town risks being lost with the 2700 dwellings proposed. I dont see the need to build these on green belt land in this AONB. Tring is a small market town and its high street retail will not be able to support a doubling in size. I understand the need to build additional housing for future development but propose the strategy downscales the number of proposed houses in Tring and looks at developing more in larger connurbations like Hemel Hempstead that can better support the additional growth.</p> <p>The proposed development only really has disadvantages for the existing residents of Tring and the scale of it is ill considered and exploitation.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6435
<b>Person ID</b>	1264928
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Simpson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The increased housing footprint on Staion Road will completley overload the already stretched environment of Tring Station and its residents.</p> <p>The infill bewteen Tring andTring Station will loose valuable green belt and public footpaths and walks in an area of outstanding natural beauty will be compromised for ever.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6559
<b>Person ID</b>	1264731
<b>Full Name</b>	Graham Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Policy SP23</b> The proposed level of new dwellings proposed for Tring is far too high and the growth areas TR01 and TR03 do not meet the criteria the council itself has asked for sites.</p> <p><b>Policy SP24</b> Any plan should involve the local people and the Town Council.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6624
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6647
<b>Person ID</b>	1264923
<b>Full Name</b>	Ken Douglas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Secretary TRING IN TRANSITION
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<p>Yes / No * Yes * No</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>NPPF guidelines requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental <b>gain</b> (NPPF para 72c) <b>and</b> is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces. There is <b>NO</b> evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around Tring.</p> <p>I propose that to help with this, the same amount of attention is given to sites allocated for physical infrastructure/building development AND to site allocated and identified for <b>proactive</b> intervention to improve wildlife, the environment, bio-diversity etc.</p> <p>This is a relatively simple move and one which many local organisations would be happy to help DBC with. See attached diagram for Tring....areas outlined in green.</p> <p><b>Detailed responses:</b></p> <p><b>Section 23.139 ‘Introduction’</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States ‘[growth will] <i>be chiefly brought forward as larger releases to help deliver</i> [new infrastructure etc.]’. Behind these words appear to be assumptions and conclusions that are not explicit in the Plan.</li> </ul> <p>It is well known in Tring that a conversation between councillors went along the lines of : ‘<i>we need more schooling and would rather have a new secondary school dedicated to Tring and therefore the associated developments must be large enough to contribute towards this.</i>’</p> <p><b>If true (and it appears to be looking at the huge housing figures) this reverse logic is utterly unacceptable. There should be no justification for increasing already excessive housing numbers in order to fund amenities that have themselves been necessitated by increased housing.</b> What is needed, instead, are alternative solutions (e.g., a 6thform collage system?)</p> <p><b>Section 23.147 ‘Tring Homes – Key Objectives’</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This appears locked in an unacceptable chain of thinking that in order to provide better facilities, strategic sites must be correspondingly on a very large scale. I would strongly argue that this is not the case. The idea that the existing residents of Tring will gain incrementally greater benefit from larger and larger developments <b>is not justified in the Plan or any of the supporting evidence.</b></li> </ul> <p>Regarding specific bullet points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘<i>provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south</i>’. This point confuses open, green and wildlife buffer spaces and/or This same error is repeated multiple times throughout the Plan. A green/open space or sports field is <u>not</u> wildlife space or corridor. There is a need for all of these – but to meet NFFP requirements –‘wildlife corridors’ need to be made explicit and mapped (NPPF para174), along with their linkage to existing wild/natural areas.</li> </ul>

- *'protect and enhance the existing wildlife site at Cow [Lane] Farm and/or provide for its translocation'*. **The option of 'translocation' is outrageous and should be removed** – an established site cannot be moved.
- *'secure the delivery of a local north-south distributor road between Bulbourne Road and London Road'*. (This sometimes stated as connecting only to Station Road – a very different scenario). The absence of any draft proposed routes, the failure to take into account existing pinch points at Cow Lane and Station Road, and lack of analysis of traffic from the north of Tring is a fundamental and serious failure and calls into question the entire proposal for East of Tring. **NO plans for the development east of Tring should be approved until this point is resolved and discussed/reviewed with the public.**

#### **Section 23.149 'Tring Employment'**

- **The retention of 'warehousing' is strongly opposed.** No evidence base is provided to justify this and there is no evidence in the Plan of discussion with Aylesbury Vale District Council despite the availability of land for warehousing just 3 miles west of Tring on the A41 dual carriageway. **Warehousing should be removed as an option. If any industry of the sort proposed is to be allowed then the size of associated buildings should be limited to no greater than that of Tring Brewery at present.**

#### **Section 23.149 'Tring Employment'**

- Plans are focussed on the 'release' of Dunsley Farm. The assumptions associated with this were established in 2017 when the proposed development of Tring was much smaller and did not include the land close to Bullbourne – **these are no longer fully valid or appropriate.** Given that there is a garden centre, building supplies and other commercial operations already present at Bulbourne, consideration should be given to a modest expansion there, thus reducing the need to concentrate more traffic on a centre that will struggle to cope; this would also provide walking-distance employment for the north end of Tr03.

#### **Section 23.150 'Tring Retail'**

- **The assumptions underpinning this section are fundamentally flawed and should be completely reconsidered.** They appear rooted in the 1980/90s and are not distinctive for Tring. The proposals for Tr06 do not take into account the revised large scale and location of housing now in the Plan.
- Traditional, food-oriented supermarket space on Tr06 no longer makes sense either in terms of scale or location (especially from an access and traffic standpoint). The alternative Tr01 proposal is also no longer appropriate.
- Regarding additional retail space in Tr06, Tring has a long history as a market town and significant success with the growth of the Farmers' Market. Modern social trends point to a clear opportunity for a permanent, modern, 'destination' food and leisure facility (e.g., evidenced by Stroud or Rotherhithe). This could be made more accessible from the High Street by moving the entrance/exit of the Forge Car Park to Brook Street and using that space for retail development instead.

#### **Section 23.152 'Tring Movement'**

- *'With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street ... Tring does not suffer significant [traffic] problems'.*



This statement is misleading because there are pinch points which, even with today's traffic levels lead to issues, and most of these are around the proposed Tr02/03 development. This includes Cow Lane, Station Road near the town centre and the bridges over the canal and railway. The Sustainable Transport Strategy does not appear to have projected the associated numbers.

### **Policy SP23 – Delivering Growth in Tring**

- Housing Delivery: States 'at least' 2731 dwellings. As noted elsewhere, even this number is untenable in the current Plan.
- There is no timescale given for any of the numbers (overall or by site), and yet these must exist as the overall growth for Dacorum is profiled by year. Why is this not stated as required by NPPF para73?
- Tr01 – To explicitly include residential accommodation for the elderly – given its close location to the town centre.
- Tr01 – State any employment space is via small units or office space.
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include reference to a supermarket (as per comments above).
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include the replacement of the Local History Museum.
- Tr06 – Should NOT still be considering multi-level developments including retail, office and/or housing – it is not in keeping with Tring's character, distracts from better use of the site and does not take into account the implications of Tr02/03 expansion.

### **Policy SP24 – Delivering Growth in East Tring paragraph 6 and Policy SP25 – Delivering Growth in South East Tring paragraph 6**

The word '*exemplar*' is used but not followed up on or defined

There is, however, a real opportunity here for DBC to shine. In keeping with Tring's past as a local leader in wind and water energy – why not be explicit in the goal to set UK leading standards. If you make it explicit then many parties and bodies will rally round to make it happen.

Let's see some ambition and vision DBC!

We recognise that Dacorum has significant challenges to address in the Local Plan. However, we have a number of very serious concerns about what is proposed. Our expectation was that the Plan defines a compelling, ambitious and distinctive future for the Borough, and Tring in particular, seizing the opportunity to show how growth can be achieved whilst simultaneously addressing other concerns of our age, including sustainability and the environment.

However, our detailed review found significant gaps, errors, flawed assumptions and also inconsistencies with stated objectives. The proposed increase in housing for Tring is far in excess of national guidelines for 'sustainable development' and assurances that this will not have a negative impact are both vague and lacking in vision. The Plan fails to set out explicit and proactive measures to mitigate the loss of Green Belt and to actively improve the environment. It also fails to define standards that are ambitious or definitive enough to shape developments appropriate for how we will live and work in the mid-21st century. In contradiction to its own stated goals, it neither defines or attempts to build upon what is distinctive about Tring and its surroundings and appears to acquiesce to classic developer-led motivations for unambitious, clone-like projects.

The overarching goals of the Local Plan cannot be achieved by small incremental changes to how development has occurred in Dacorum over the last 50 years. Meeting the latest national and Hertfordshire position on environmental sustainability, wildlife corridors and green spaces alone will require specific, planned and proactive interventions. These are lacking in the Plan as it stands. And all new developments should be held to the highest possible standards for energy efficient construction and use. Again, the Plan ‘lacks teeth’ in this regard.

In the following pages our detailed review highlights particular concerns, cross referenced to the appropriate section of the Plan and/or supporting documents.

In the spirit of constructively helping to improve the Plan we have also included our thoughts on what makes Tring distinctive and how this can help shape a better vision and higher standard of proposals suited to this unique corner of Dacorum.

The following is a summary of our key concerns, which are expanded upon in our detailed response below. In addition, given the absence of a distinctive vision for Tring and its surroundings, we have also summarised key visions for how the current Local Plan can be changed and lead to a better outcome for our town, Dacorum and our neighbours.

- 1 A very high percentage of expansion at Tring is proposed to be on Green Belt land and we believe there is a strong case that any developments on former Green Belt land should be **held to the highest possible environmentally friendly, sustainability and energy efficiency** Explicit provision should be made for this – if we want distinctive, exemplar development this must be mandated. In addition, the NPPF also calls for ‘for compensatory improvements to be made to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land’ and this must also be explicit with minimum 10% net gain. This is not at present explicitly addressed and is a significant point of non-compliance.
- 2 The proposed growth of over 2700 new homes is not compliant with the heart of NPPF guidance for ‘sustainable development’. It is proportionately by far the largest urban growth across Dacorum in a location that is arguably least well suited for it. It is significantly above the evidence-based proportion for Tring based on population growth through the Plan period as amended by the Government’s ‘affordability’ formula (evidenced in the September 2020 SW Herts Local Housing document). Even if the numbers decrease significantly after recently announced Government changes there is no information in the Plan about prioritisation for reduced numbers (this needs to be made public) and it is likely the essence of the plan will remain much the same. Therefore, the following concerns remain valid:
- 3 The proposed north–south link road from Bulbourne to London Road via Station Road is ill- defined and cuts through a major wildlife corridor – Marshcroft Lane – and an AONB. It is therefore subject to constraints that have yet to be examined, yet it seems key to the present development plan for Tr03. **No development on Tr03 should be sanctioned until this is fully resolved.**
- 4 The provisions for green/wildlife corridors (especially in Tr01, 02 and 03) are confused, inadequately defined and fall well short of the provision called for in the most recent Herts Environment and Sustainability guidelines (Nov 2020). In particular, the corridors are poorly linked together and do not explicitly protect the hedgerows (including Marshcroft Lane) and the surrounding countryside that are a key part of the character of the area and vital to local **Overall, the plan for Tring falls short of NPPF para 147, and paras 99/100.**

- 5 The proposals for Tr06 (Brook St) are based on assumptions that are no longer valid given other stated goals and the growth in development elsewhere in Tring. **They also miss a clear opportunity to provide distinctive and modern facilities better suited to the mid-21st century.**
- 6 Public transport goals are aspirational only and there is nothing in the Plan that convincingly addresses transport between Tring Station and the town centre or around the new developments, or which supports modern, novel solutions.
- 7 Net carbon neutrality is an essential target and new developments present an ideal opportunity to meet the highest standards. We note DBC policy of 2020 is to be zero carbon by 2030. The Plan makes several references to 'exemplar' development but falls short of explicitly defining standards for energy efficiency (through building standards) and the inclusion of extensive local energy capture (e.g., via solar) etc. The Plan does not set the bar high enough with respect to these at present.
- 8 Tring is flanked on two sides by Buckinghamshire and traffic, town centre use, schooling and employment patterns are influenced very strongly by this. **There is no reference to liaison with Bucks in the** We are concerned that conclusions about the locations of employment, retail and recreational sites are flawed in places and generally sub-optimised as a result. The same is also true when looking at environmental considerations.
- 9 A key and important goal, first built into the Issues and Options (2017) Plan, is for the Local Plan and developments to reflect local distinctiveness. **There is no evidence that Tring's distinctive character (in its history, town economy, unique location, etc.) has been defined, and there is therefore no associated vision; this presents an unacceptably high risk of generic, unsympathetic development.**
  - We are concerned that many of the assumptions and conclusions reached from the Issues and Options (2017) version of the Local Plan are no longer relevant or optimal for what is now a much larger and very different development – in particular with regard to proposals for Tr06 and Tr01 which are fundamentally flawed in several respects.
  - The proposals for Tr02 and Tr03 are excessive in scale for a development with a stated goal of being 'compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character' of a small market town. Considerations around supporting infrastructure (roads in particular) and mitigating Green Belt loss are insufficiently developed
  - NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces – there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around Tring. This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key 'honey pots' of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.
  - The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum requires developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and there is little to no evidence that this has been given meaningful consideration for Tring
  - Throughout the Plan there is confusion between what constitutes green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors and lack of explicit requirements around wildlife corridors, hedgerows and buffer zones (DBC Urban Nature Study maps; Herts Biological Records Centre 2005/6).

- The Plan must be more explicit on matters relating to Hertfordshire’s Sustainability Strategy and the priorities defined by the HCCSP – in particular, there is a clear opportunity to mandate the highest possible standards for renewable energy use, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity
- There are too many caveats and vagueness of intent for a Plan proposing such significant impact on the character of the town and surroundings
- There is an absence of even approximate timelines for the proposed developments, by site
- States that ‘growth will be sustainable transport / accessibility and infrastructure led’ – we would agree with this sentiment; however, it is disappointing that the Infrastructure Plan was not ready for inclusion in the LP and we ask for a commitment on a date for its publication for public consultation
- States ‘[growth will] *be chiefly brought forward as larger releases to help deliver* [new infrastructure]’. Buried behind this statement are several assumptions and conclusions that appear not to have been made explicit in the Plan and have emerged, instead, only from consultation with local councillors.

A worrying example of this is: ‘*we need more schooling and would rather have a new secondary school dedicated to Tring and therefore the associated developments must be large enough to contribute towards this.*’

If this method of reasoning has driven the Plan then it should be made clear and explicit for public scrutiny and challenge. We would, therefore, seek assurances that all such cases are explicitly identified and highlighted.

### **Section 23.143 ‘Tring Homes’ (Page 234)**

- A significant proportion of the future housing (around 2,200 dwellings) will be delivered as urban extensions through the release from the Green Belt of the following strategic sites: East of Tring (1,400 dwellings), New Mill (400 dwellings), Dunsley Farm (400 dwellings). However, densities on Tr01/Tr02/Tr03 are not stated despite seemingly being required by NPPF para 123b
- As key objectives this list is very disappointing and sets the bar too low for what Tring deserves and for such a large-scale and impactful development on Green Belt It does little to build on the distinctiveness of Tring and it is not explicit enough about the importance of green/climate/environment issues. An opportunity to define a more aspirational goal for Tring in the mid-21st century has not been taken.

Furthermore, it appears locked in an unimaginative chain of thinking: that in order to provide better facilities, strategic sites must be correspondingly on a very large scale. We would strongly argue that this is not the case.

The flawed assumption about secondary school provision has already been highlighted above as an example. **The notion that the existing people of Tring will gain incrementally greater benefit from larger and larger developments is not justified in the Plan or any of the supporting evidence.**

Regarding specific bullet points:

- ‘*provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south*’. We are very concerned that this point confuses open, green and wildlife buffer spaces and/or corridors. This same confusion/obfuscation is repeated multiple times throughout the Plan. A green/open space or sports field is not wildlife space or corridor.

- There is a need for all of these – but to meet NFFP requirements – ‘wildlife corridors’ need to be made explicit and mapped (NPPF para174), along with their linkage to existing wild/natural areas
- *‘protect and enhance the existing wildlife site at Cow [Lane] Farm and/or provide for its translocation’*. **We strongly object to the optionality of ‘translocation’** – such an established site cannot be moved. The last six words need to be removed.
  - *‘secure the delivery of a local north-south distributor road between Bulbourne Road and London Road’*. This is inconsistently referred to in the Plan (sometimes connecting only to Station Road – which is a very different scenario). The absence of any draft proposed routes, the apparent failure to take into account existing pinch points at Cow Lane, Station Road/London Road junction and the Bulbourne Road/Icknield Way junction, or to give consideration to the implications of bisecting Marshcroft Lance, and lack of mention/analysis of traffic from the north of Tring are a real concern. **NO plans for the development of Tr02/Tr03 should be approved until this point is resolved and subject to separate public consultation**
  - *‘include screen planting along London Road and ensure appropriate buffer / noise mitigation to the A41’*. We welcome screen planting – especially in conjunction with well-defined wildlife corridors and green/open spaces. Although we acknowledge separate jurisdiction, the opportunity should be taken to use low-noise surfaces on the A41 along the full length of Tring
  - **The retention of ‘warehousing’ is strongly opposed.** No evidence base is provided to justify this and there is no evidence in the Plan of discussion with Aylesbury Vale District Council despite the availability of land for warehousing just 3 miles west of Tring on the A41 dual. Warehousing provides minimal jobs, is land hungry (thus removing land for other, preferable, use), is usually 24/7 and thus generates noise pollution, light pollution and vehicle emission pollution during unsocial hours/night-time. **Warehousing should be removed as an option and a modest maximum industrial building size established.**
  - Regarding Tr01, the proposal for some employment provision is supported, provided that this is only small units – noting that permission has been granted to extend larger industrial units at the west end of Tring by adding to the existing Icknield Road industrial area, which is adjacent to an interchange with the A41 dual carriageway. The proposed small units at Tr01 should be sufficiently flexible to be adaptable to use as ‘home working’ hubs, the demand for which is increasing, and which would support policy (climate change) by reducing the carbon footprint of commuting. Increasing working opportunity from base within the community could also lead to increased support/viability for local businesses
  - The retention of Brook Street (Silk Mill) Business Park as employment is strongly supported, as provision of employment within the community/market town is a key factor in achieving sustainability
  - Plans are focussed on the ‘release’ of Dunsley Farm. The assumptions associated with this were established in 2017 when the proposed development of Tring was much smaller and did not include the land close to Bullbourne – **these are no longer fully valid or appropriate.** Given that there is a garden centre, building supplies and other commercial operations already present at Bulbourne, consideration should be given to a modest expansion there,

thus reducing the need to concentrate more traffic on a centre that will struggle to cope; this would also provide walking-distance employment for the north end of TR03

- There is no mention of how the plan will explicitly support new forms of public transport. This omission should be addressed, not at a site level but for across Tring and the surrounding Other Local Plans elsewhere in the UK have considered autonomous electric transport routes, for example – we'd like to see and would welcome more of the ambition seen in HCCSP transport priorities reflected here.
- **We believe the assumptions underpinning this section are fundamentally flawed and the recommendations should be completely reconsidered.** We agree that there is limited call for traditional additional retail space; however, the other points appear rooted in '20th- century thinking' and are not distinctive for Tring. The proposals for Tr06 do not take into account the revised large scale and location of housing now in the plan
- Traditional, food-oriented supermarket space on Tr06 no longer makes sense either in terms of scale or location (especially from an access and traffic standpoint). The alternative Tr01 proposal is also no longer appropriate – it is sub-optimal for developments in Tr02 and most of Tr03, inconveniently located and needlessly adding to We strongly recommend the entire proposal is reconsidered. Thought should be given to a site off Bulbourne Road, which would be more accessible from the proposed new developments, the north of Tring and the villages to the north of Tring.
- Consideration should also be given to the sort of scheme that has been successful elsewhere (e.g. Bicester) of relocating the existing (Tesco) supermarket to elsewhere on Tr01 and using that site for small business (instead of Tr01). Or as a residential home, given the projected large growth in the over-65 population
- Regarding additional retail space in Tr06, Tring has a long history as a market town and significant success with the growth of the Farmers' Modern social trends point to a clear opportunity for a permanent, modern, 'destination' food and leisure facility (e.g., evidenced by Stroud or Rotherhithe). This could be made more accessible from the High Street by moving the entrance/exit of the Forge Car Park to Brook Street and using that space for retail development instead.
- *'With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street ...Tring does not suffer significant [traffic] problems'*. This statement is very misleading and disappointing. It is disappointing in so far as the only solution proposed in the plan to mitigate Brook Street congestion appears to be building a north-south link road which will create the unintended consequence of becoming an unofficial 'East Tring bypass' and has challenging routing across the significant wildlife corridor of Marshcroft Lane

We would recommend considering creative options to alleviate congestion on Brook Street. The statement is also misleading because there are pinch points which even with today's traffic levels lead to issues – and most of these are around the proposed Tr02/03 development – including Cow Lane, Station Road near the town centre and the bridges over the canal and railway. The Sustainable Transport Strategy does not appear to have projected the associated numbers and this must be a concern

- The High Street is frequently congested with large tailbacks. Consideration should be given to partial or occasional pedestrianisation. Pedestrianising not only reduces car journeys, but also increases footfall, dwell time and ultimately retail spend for shops in places where it has been implemented sensibly (see

<http://www.savills.co.uk/blog/article/207611/commercial-property/what-will-the-pedestrianisation-of-oxford-street-mean-for-retail-.aspx>).

- This section states, *'The careful location of new development and promoting opportunities for sustainable travel, including improved cycle and pedestrian routes and bus services, will contribute in a significant way to making the town more accessible in ways that do not rely on motorised transport. It is important to minimise road going trips to limit congestion and promote walkable neighbourhoods.'* This further reinforces the case that it would be sensible to provide a supermarket at the Bulbourne end of Tr02 within walking distance of the new eastern development rather than having two supermarkets in close proximity (23.150) and likewise with regards to employment (23.148).
- This section notes an east–west cycleway linking to existing and proposed We welcome this but are concerned that there is no joined-up route map available for public scrutiny. The Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Policy specifies a number of proposed cycle paths and notes the intention that 'it is important that new residents establish good habits when they move into Tring'. In effect this means such cycleways need to be at least laid out and preferably constructed **before** major development takes place.
- Cites the north–south link road between Bulbourne Road and Station Road which *'could help address congestion blackspots and improve traffic movements around Tring'*. This statement is inconsistent with 23.147. Such a link road would simply move congestion spots. This road has not been planned and the unintended consequences of its construction have not been reviewed, contra to NPPF para108c, or subjected to public scrutiny. Until that time assumptions should not be made about what it may achieve. Also see comment on section 23 147.
- States *'an assessment of parking demand and mitigation measures should accompany the development of Growth Area'*. We support this view, noting such assessments seem to be required by NPPF para108 to be within the LP, and also note that illicit parking within a kilometre of Tring Station is already an issue. New developments in Tr03 will become a magnet for parking on residential streets even if capacity is addressed (due to cost). It should not be beyond the scope of the Plan to make creative solutions a condition, in collaboration with Network Rail:
  - Designing new developments to support autonomous electric transport
  - Ensuring that those sharing cars would get preferential parking and reduced rates
  - Likewise, for those using electric vehicles.
- It is clear that new development in Tring will attract those wishing to commute into The Plan acknowledges capacity issue on the railways. An increase in the numbers, suggested by the Plan (even in a post-Covid economy) may tip the service over and have an adverse impact on those travelling and on the economy of the town. We would like to see agreed, joined-up plans to increase to capacity before new development on the scale planned goes ahead.

#### **Policy SP23 – Delivering Growth in Tring (Pages 236-238)**

- Housing Delivery: States *'at least'* 2731 As noted elsewhere, even this number is untenable in the current Plan.
- There is no timescale given for any of the numbers (overall or by site), and yet these must exist as the overall growth for Dacorum is profiled by Why is this not stated as required by NPPF para73?
- Tr01 – To explicitly include residential accommodation for the elderly – given its close location to the town centre
- Tr01 – State any employment space is via small units or office space

- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include reference to a supermarket (as per comments above).
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include the replacement of the Local History Museum
- Tr06 – Should NOT still be considering multi-level developments including retail, office and/or housing – it is not in keeping with Tring’s character, distracts from better use of the site and does not take into account the implications of Tr02/03 expansion
- Paragraph 5 states, ‘*promote sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised as well as the transport outcomes detailed in the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy*’. Although well-intentioned, the walking element of this has the challenge of distance: the mid-section of Tr03 and Tr02 being 1 mile from Tring town centre, and the areas to the east of mid-point being a greater distance, thus above the 20-minute walking time for a fit person, and significantly beyond that for elderly people and parents with buggies/toddlers. This will inevitably lead to greater car dependency

**and Policy SP25 – Delivering Growth in South East Tring (Page 240) paragraph 6**

- 1 The word ‘*exemplar*’ is used but not expanded We welcome the word exemplar and set out below what this means in practice. There is a real opportunity – in keeping with Tring’s past as a local leader in wind and water energy – to make this a reality:
- 2 Energy generation: the word ‘*exemplar*’ implies a really great example of what can be We would welcome an approach that seeks to deploy heat and power microgeneration technology to every building as a default position, and then removes those technologies/locations which may not be appropriate (for example solar PV on a north-facing roof). This would be the optimum way to achieve an ‘*exemplar*’.
- 3 Mapping of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy is required by NPPF We would welcome a detailed approach for this in respect of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03.
- 4 Ultimately, based on the energy hierarchy, it would be better to seek the highest possible performance of the building fabric (e.g., Passivhaus standard, energy-focused site design) and so have to incorporate fewer renewable generation Ideally both would be included within the exemplar, but if a choice has to be made, we recommend prioritising low-energy buildings over energy generation technologies.
- 5 The ‘*exemplar*’ approach should be applied to all buildings and structures within the proposed development, including residential, commercial, retail, schools etc. Even car parking areas can benefit, for example from ‘solar carports’ which could also become charging hubs for eVs, electric bikes etc.
- 6 If it is felt that the ‘*exemplar*’ level of deployment of renewable energy generation is too hard to achieve by commercial means (i.e. through encouraging developers), then consideration should be given to including a ‘permitted development’ approach at an early stage within the development whereby spaces (e.g. rooftops, land areas etc.) can be left available for the implementation of later community energy projects without planning constraints, as long as they fit the permitted development criteria. It will not be difficult to get the funding from the community for projects which directly benefit residents and businesses, and this will also foster a sense of ‘community ownership’.
- 7 Another issue when looking at renewable energy generation and consumption within a contiguous area (e.g., housing estate, retail/commercial area) is the ability for excess electricity generation to be used locally/on site by other Currently this is difficult to achieve due to electricity distribution and licensing constraints, but a few schemes



are emerging under the recently funded 'local energy market trials' (example: <https://project-leo.co.uk/about/the-leo-project/>, Cornish homes take part in trial to supply clean power to grid | Environment | The Guardian). This is already the norm in some European countries (e.g., Germany) and will likely take hold in the UK in the next 3-5 years in a meaningful way.

8 For the new developments proposed, there is an opportunity to incorporate the necessary provisions (space, infrastructure) for creating a largely independent local renewable energy grid, which would allow the following principles to be implemented:

1. Residents and businesses generate most of their electricity and heat needs on-premises.
2. Excess (electricity) generation would be fed to a local/on-site energy storage scheme, available for consumption by other residents/businesses.
3. If the total generation in the local grid exceeds the total consumption at a given time, the excess may either be stored or exported to the wider grid (in our area, UK Power Networks at present).
4. If the total consumption in the local grid exceeds the total generation plus the energy which can be delivered from the energy storage system, additional power is drawn centrally from the wider grid.
5. Depending on the technology deployed, the electrical energy requirements and the timeframe, there may or may not still be the need for an 'emergency' direct feed from the individual premises to the wider grid. 'Emergency heat' would come from an electric heat pump or similar on-premises provision.
  - This would enable the newly developed areas to run almost fully on renewably generated heat and electricity, increasing resilience, minimising CO2 emissions, and promoting conscious use of valuable A complementary factor would be having low-energy buildings in the first instance.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Area.pdf (1)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6648
<b>Person ID</b>	1264867
<b>Full Name</b>	Corinne Fleming
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The proposed strategy for Tring would clearly detract from the town's character as it will increase the town's population by over 50% in less than 20 years - over development on a huge scale. It will not minimise the development of the green belt as it represents a major reduction of the green belt land around the town and it would also have a detrimental impact on the Chilterns AONB. It therefore represents a complete disregard for the existing character of the town and the landscape.

It is not acceptable to increase a town to this extent. It would make more sense to increase the number of additional homes in Hemel Hempstead where an increase would have smaller effect on a larger town. The council could also choose to develop housing on land around the industrial estate or redevelop under used office space so that less prime agricultural land is sacrificed and so that development would have no impact on the AONB.

The development recently agreed by Dacorum already in progress in Roman Park in Tring has resulted in a major blight on the view from the AONB. The first houses have been built right on the skyline of the hill to the west of the town, much higher than all the other neighbouring buildings in Tring. This development has not been done with any sensitivity to the green belt, the character of the town or the AONB.

Furthermore, information in the press suggests that the projections for Dacorum's housing needs have been based on old data - if this is correct then the projections must be recalculated before any agreement is given to any further loss of green belt.

The town's services such as car parking in the town centre, GP services, etc cannot accommodate this proposed uplift in the population. No-one living in these proposed sites (other than possible TR01) will walk into the town and will expect to be able to park their cars when they get there.

The enormous growth in population in Tring would significantly increase pollution (noise and fumes) in the town and the surrounding countryside and the AONB.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6725
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The size of these developments is unacceptable and would destroy Tring as a town.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6727
<b>Person ID</b>	1265066
<b>Full Name</b>	Greta Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Firstly I have comments on the national housing situation, and secondly on Tring.</p> <p>Why are we discussing Local Plan when the Government agreed in mid-November to rebalance the faulty algorithm, so that there would be more building and more share of the economy in towns and cities in the North, and less building on Green Belt in the South.</p> <p>Due to the pandemic, the collapse of the retail sector, and the new situation of many people working from home, there will be a glut of commercial properties which can be converted into residences. This is already being planned by John Lewis.</p> <p>The need for so many houses should be reduced, as 800,000 foreign nationals have left the UK this year, as well as those who left due to Brexit.</p> <p>As a Tring resident, I am part of the thriving community of this small historic market town. The character of the town will change completely with the plan for 2,730 new dwellings, which could mean 8,000 more people.</p> <p>In normal times, Tring Station car park is completely full by 9am on weekdays, so another huge car park would be required at Tring station.</p> <p>Overall my objection is that the unique character of Tring and it's close community will never be the same again, with such a high percentage of new building.</p> <p>Hopefully when the Government change their plans to build in towns and cities on brownfield sites, and convert empty commercial properties, the housing requirements will be much reduced, and rural areas will be able to remain unspoilt.</p>

My objections are mainly due to the fact that Tring is surrounded by Green Belt immediately adjacent to the current "built" land.

In addition, to the North and East immediately beyond the Green Belt, is AONB land which would suffer severe impact from any extension to the current town boundary.

We must protect our local towns.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6822

**Person ID** 1265092

**Full Name** Derek & Janet Townsend

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We are writing to object most strongly to the plans, which have recently become available, of the massive development of Tring.

Tring is a small Market Town with small, mostly privately owned, shops, a wonderful community spirit and surrounded by beautiful countryside, which is part of the Chilterns area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and which is gradually being eroded. We feel that the infrastructure will be unable to cope with this huge development and will change the entire character of Tring. People will go out of the town to shop, thus causing more problems for the road structure.

Tring has already one large development in progress on the Icknield Way. Surely this is enough.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6848

**Person ID** 1265095

<b>Full Name</b>	Jemima Frances
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring is currently a delightful, living, thriving and kind community. The current proposal would destroy our local countryside, increase the population to such a huge extent our lovely town would then resemble Luton or Dunstable. We also have a wonderful local museum and Auction House, they shouldn't be just shunted away as proposed. This is AWFUL!</p> <p>We already have a glut of housing stock already on the market for sale. The trouble is the prices are completely unaffordable for many. Developed are in this for one thing only - PROFIT! They may claim to offer some affordable housing, but we have experienced this before and those few houses they offer are too small and are NOT affordable.</p> <p>What Tring needs are a FEW houses that are 3 bedroom, for social housing. Proper social housing for current families here. There is a vast number of families desperate to swap from a 2 bedroom home to a 3 bedroom one, but they cannot afford private rent and haven't a hope of buying.</p> <p>We really do NOT need more homes priced at half a million pounds. There are many currently on the market!</p> <p>We DO need to preserve our green belt, we need our doctors, dentists, schools, pharmacists etc to be able to serve their community and not have such an insane population increase.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6852
<b>Person ID</b>	1265057
<b>Full Name</b>	Clive Turner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposed housing development for Tring appears to be of such a size that it will swamp all local services, whether schools, shopping, transport or health. I would like to see the modelling that is used to justify this level of housing need in Tring itself, and in particular the modelling that supports particular types of new homes ie whether for families, downsizers, single occupancy etc. The biggest future need for homes is among the over 55s and this is not recognised in the development plan for Tring or any other part of the Plan, as far as I can tell.</p> <p>For the houses proposed in Tring (and generally in the Development Plan) I see no specific targets for low carbon standards. There's reference to low embodied carbon, however that's not a well understood concept in housing. Instead why is the Council not specifically targeting a building fabric standard (and low-carbon heating and power on individual homes where district heating is not an option [most cases]). Overall I find the sustainability strategy very woolly. I'd have much more reassurance if you said you were complying with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and promised to work with builders who were aligned with those goals (House Builders like Berkeley Homes).</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6880
<b>Person ID</b>	1261827
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Brener
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This is an awful way of getting a response from ordinary citizens. The document is over long and unreadable. It is ridiculous and irresponsible that this is happening during such an unprecedented crisis for our country. I can't believe that this is legitimate.

I endorse the response from the CCG

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6971

**Person ID** 1263321

**Full Name** TSEL Secretary TSEL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

- Identifies on p232, 23.141 - *that there is no made neighbourhood plan*. Clearly, this should be the priority item for DBC ahead of any determination on the DBC Local Plan and Tornadoes looks forward to contributing to this critical input to the future Local Plan.
- In 23.146 on p234 –*significant new public open space*. Tornadoes would like to see the detail of what size, location and usage make up will be and in whose ownership this open space will be in the future. Tornadoes is determined to ensure that Tring does not suffer a Durrants Lane issue around available playing space like Berkhamsted is currently enduring and has been for 9 years now, in relation to 3 football pitches that are still not commissioned into use.
- Bullet point 4 in 23.147, sets out that DBC will *provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south*. Tornadoes, being the largest football club in the town, with circa 500 players across 33 teams, that this is actually a significant number of new football pitches and would like to see evidence in the Tr01 Developers outline plan that this requirement is fully met and at what scale.
- Bullet point 8 in 23.147 on p235, sets out that DBC will *provide and support new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and Tring Station and 23.154 Existing housing growth to the west of Tring will deliver a new east-west shared cycle and footpath that will link the existing and proposed residential neighbourhoods to the wider cycle and footpath network at the A41 roundabout and beyond to Aston Clinton. Other improvements are proposed there that will upgrade public rights of way and improve accessibility to buses*. Tornadoes supports this and is keen to see that the improved pedestrian pathways and cycle links provision for Tring reaches from LA5 in the far west of Tring and as far North as Tring Corinthians on the Icknield Way, all the way through to the top

end of Cow Lane (via Station Road and the A4251, as well as through TR01) and along the A4251 to link in to the Football, Hockey and Rugby facilities at Cow Roast. They should also link TR02 and Tr03 to Cow Lane too.

- On p236 23.159 sets out *provision for associated playing fields*. Within TR01, Tr02 and Tr03, Tornadoes would like to see now what the proposed location, size and configuration of these playing fields is expected to be and what the usage arrangements for them will be.
- Bullet point 4 in 23.163 on p238 sets out that TR03 will deliver *a new sporting and leisure hub*. Tornadoes would like to see now what the proposed location, size and configuration of this sporting and leisure hub is expected to be and what the ownership & usage arrangements for them will be.
- On p239 23.165 does not make any reference to open spaces generally or football pitches in particular. For the avoidance of doubt, Tornadoes would like to see this properly defined, ahead of any development approvals.

Specifically in relation to **Policy SP25 - Delivering Growth at South East Tring** (p239/240) Tornadoes would like to see a bullet point 9 added that locks in the circa 18 hectares of land covering Cow Lane Farm down and round to the cricket and tennis clubs, as football / sports playing space from as early as September 2022. Tornadoes is ready to take on responsibility for this playing space effective immediately.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6986

**Person ID** 1265081

**Full Name** Caitlin Neale

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

As with Berkhamsted...for Tring, flawed windfall calculations, projection (based on flawed models and data) and the lack of a national strategy that takes into consideration long term regional development rebalance leads to a faulty delivery strategy. It appears to be prioritising building on greenbelt over and above Hemel brownbelt. The suggest that decision have been biased by developer influence, supporting development in areas with higher premiums, which makes the commitment to 40% affordable housing (in areas with 10+homes being built) seem naive.

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7029
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Council admits serious challenges with the location of Tring station, including poor access and limited parking. The plan to improve the cycle lane along Station Road is an entirely inadequate mitigant for the number of homes being built. The majority of users of the station will drive, and those who cycle / walk will be far less likely to in the colder/darker months. The station car park is often full by mid-morning already, what will be done with regards to this, or are commuters simply expected to catch earlier and earlier trains to secure a space?</p> <p>The plan mentions a potential cycle lane from Pitstone to Tring Station along Northfield Road, to reduce car use from Pitstone (which is itself building new homes), yet this idea has already been dismissed in a study by the Council due to the speed or the road and limited ability to build a standalone cyclelane.</p> <p>Building so many new houses in Tring will bring commuting nightmares for those who use Tring Station - a serious rethink of transport infrastructure enhancements need to be considered before this moves forward.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7048
<b>Person ID</b>	1265096
<b>Full Name</b>	David Ball
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The allocation of 2,731 houses to Tring plus the associated amenities proposed under the local plan would increase the size of the town by c.50%, an allocation which would potentially adversely impact the character of the town.</p> <p>Whilst the local plan does recognise the fact that there will be increased requirement for amenities, such as schools and fire appliances, it does not address the facilities that are provided by non-governmental bodies, for example the trains. The Tring station already suffers from poor public transport and a car park which regularly overflows, the plan needs to be addressed holistically.</p> <p>If the excessive housing is to be imposed upon the town, then a more holistic approach to transport links needs to be addressed. In many cases the site assessment has considered local access, but not where those vehicles move to after they have departed the development site, for example the main roads into the town centre from the Icknield Way (Brook Street, Frogmore Street, Christchurch Road and Miswell Lane) all suffer from large amounts of on street parking which already causes traffic issues leading to significant danger to pedestrians. The nature of many of the properties along these thoroughfares does not lend itself to widening the roads. This myopic view of traffic assessment limited to a limited number of local junctions continues to be a deficiency of many local plans and the planning applications that inevitably follow.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7076
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The proposals for Tring would change the character of the village beyond recognition and are quite unacceptable. Too late to elaborate.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7089
<b>Person ID</b>	1265130
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Laferton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Main concern is that I cannot clearly see what hospital provision there is planned. With all the house building on the Tring side of Aylesbury and in Tring, Stoke Mandeville Hospital will not be able to expand to cope. While Drs surgeries can be added (though there are not clear indications of where this will be either), planning to extend hospitals needs more preparation. Though Watford General is not our local hospital, it is yet another one that is one a site insufficient for the local population and the debates about what to do with it do not seem to lead to any action. A quick search for 'hospital' in this planning document has only highlighted that the area is to lose the hospital provision in Hemel to be replaced by 'something'. It is clear these houses will be built; people will be moving to the area; they will get sick, have babies, need A&E care and you have not planned how to deal with this. Covid-19 has shown how close to capacity hospitals are and such an oversight in the planning shows little respect for the the important role hospitals play in the community. And they need to be in the community; not a long commute away.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7118
<b>Person ID</b>	1145885
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Oliver Pengelley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The delivery strategy for Tring is extremely problematic and I oppose the bulk of it in its current form.</p> <p>Before giving detail, I reiterate my comments that attempting to take this plan forward when: (a) potential changes to planning requirements and housing allocations from central government are imminent; and (b) when the impact of Covid 19 on land use and social and demographic patterns is not yet fully known is ill advised. I understand other councils and local authorities have paused their plans and I do not see why this cannot be done for Dacorum. Pushing ahead is alarming because it is undoubted that Covid will have a significant and long-lasting impact on land use and development, less office space will be required raising the possibility of more changes of use and brownfield, thereby decreasing the case for developing green belt lands.</p> <p>This plan commits to a substantial development of Tring, 2700 homes or a 55% increase in size, and I am concerned that should revisions to the plan become necessary as a result of possible changes, then the precedent for development will already have been set.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the plan commits to highly specific development targets in terms of the number of houses to be built, but its commitments to the accompanying infrastructure needed with any increase in size are not similarly specific. The statement on infrastructure (23.139) is woolly and I am concerned that any lack of specificity will be seized upon by property developers whose first priority is the generation of profits for shareholders (which they do to great effect, as often reported in the media), not the quality of housing nor the provision of appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>The development strategy threatens the destruction of Tring's character, the character of its rural setting, and to place significant pressure on the town's infrastructure and amenities.</p> <p>The strategy highlights Tring's setting in the Chilterns (23.136) and that development should be sensitive to this (23.140). Tring is situated close by the Ridgeway National trail on the section that runs from Ivinghoe Beacon, through Pitstone Hill, and moves around the South East corner of Tring. When one walks that section of the Ridgeway it is clear that the development of the area Tr03 will forever change the topography, views, and setting of this section of the Chilterns. No amount of sensitivity to this setting can mitigate this, as the issue is scale of the proposed development and the amount of greenbelt it will consume. This will be self-evident to anyone who walks in these hills.</p> <p>The strategy acknowledges that the town centre has a strong individual character (23.137) and that this should be protected and enhanced (23.140). Yet the suggestions with regards to TR06 promise to do completely the opposite. The Local Museum, Marketplace, and Auctions are all central parts of Tring and its distinctive character. Any change to them would be contrary to the Local Plan's commitment to 'deliver great places', and would also fail to safeguard the historic assets of the borough. The proposal to replace this with a supermarket, retail, and offices or houses will destroy an important aspect of the town's character, lead to overdevelopment and worsening traffic issues on Brook Street and the Robin Hood Roundabout. Presumably the promise to maintain the same level of parking means building a multi-story car park which would be deeply inappropriate in the context of Tring's small and historic town centre.</p>

The strategy describes Tring as compact market town (23.151) aims for cycle and foot connections, but reality 2700 dwellings will bring at least 3000 new cars and possibly upwards of 5000, if a minority wish to use the town centre by car this will overload existing facilities and compromise the towns character and appeal as a destination. It is simply not realistic to include lots of text about cycle and footpaths and public transport as a way of distracting from the above fact, which should be central to the consideration of the proposal, we need to be realistic about its impact not merely optimistic.

This volume of cars will overload existing parking in the town centre which (pre-pandemic) was frequently stretched, and many of the roads at key times of day, particularly Brook Street, Miswell Lane, Station Road, Western Road, all of which have sections where parked cars mean that two lanes of traffic cannot continuously flow. The historic high street's limitations means that delivery vans frequently block one carriageway of traffic, this can cause tailbacks and aggressive driving that will only be worsened by the increase in vehicles - not to mention the decrease in appeal for pedestrians.

For employment, the strategy highlights the need to balance population growth with local employment creation (23.149) to limit commuting. If we estimate that the 2,700 new dwellings will bring 4,000 new working-age adults in full time employment, it is clear that the proposal to increase employment in Tring is going to fall massively short of this total. It is hard not to conclude that the vast majority of these individuals will need to commute, and so these additional developments will have the character of dormitory settlements, further eroding the community and character of Tring and adding to transport issues noted above as well as the lack of sufficient parking at the station (pre-pandemic).

Ultimately the real problem with the strategy from which the majority of the above stems is the vast size of the proposed developments. Tring is a historic town which has increased to what are nearing the limits that can be supported by its existing infrastructure. While this strategy promises additional infrastructure, it cannot make the high street or Brook street wider, nor massively increase town-centre parking without the destruction of buildings or the centre's character. To think that the thousands of new residents will all cycle, walk, or get the bus into town is naive in the extreme.

The delivery strategy - and the local plan as a whole - fails the people it is meant to be written for – the existing local residents of Tring. It cannot meet its own objectives surrounding maintaining the existing character of Tring and its setting, nor to create appropriate infrastructure. It risks ruining this character by altering key features of the town while simultaneously turning it into a bland dormitory, characterised by high-density (gardenless) housing and generic retail. It must be significantly revised.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7142
<b>Person ID</b>	1265074
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Wilson

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Far too much development for a small market town. Its character would be destroyed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7162
<b>Person ID</b>	1265136
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Connor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>"Tr06 - High Street / Brook Street Food and drink, and leisure uses; Car parking, including at least as many public parking spaces as at present" - there's a danger that this development will only attract fast food takeaways and chain pubs, and will need an unsightly multi-storey to provide all of the parking. In these difficult times it's hard to see any other outcome, as retailers have been leaving Tring High Street.</p> <p>"23.144 Development will nevertheless need to be sensitively designed and laid out to respect the setting of this important landscape designation, including in long distance views from the east." - looking from the hills above Tring, it is difficult to believe that the Tr03 substantial housing development can be shielded. It's likely to appear as densely packed urban sprawl (as the development at Roman Park is becoming).</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7212
<b>Person ID</b>	1265124
<b>Full Name</b>	Jim Eite
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly object to the Tring Delivery Strategy and the Local Plan which proposes 16,600 new homes to be built primarily on 850 hectares of green belt around Tring, Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead in the next 18 years.</p> <p>This growth in household numbers is a 25% increase over the current housing, which would irrevocably change the character of our towns and villages and destroy valuable green belt habitat and amenity. Dacorum Borough have chosen to accept these Central Government imposed growth figures that are not substantiated by evidence and are based upon outdated ONS projections and an arbitrary and misguided algorithm.</p> <p>I support the need for a local plan and accept the need to build a reasonable number of new, sustainable and affordable properties in the Borough. The latest ONS data available projects 6051 new homes in Dacorum by 2038 – 64% FEWER than this plan projects. This figure post-pandemic is also likely to decrease as housing stock is created in urban centres as many businesses reduce overheads and costs, and exit to a more remote working environment.</p> <p>In this plan, thousands of new homes are simply bolted onto the perimeters of our existing towns over green belt land with inadequate thought to the pressures on water supplies, traffic needs, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements). There is little sustainable about the construction nor preserving of our heritage about this plan.</p> <p>Rather than as an afterthought, sustainability should be at the absolute core of the proposed future developments in the Local Plan - this is recommended by national planning guidance and should be a given in the current climate. This draft Local Plan fails to demonstrate a pathway to local zero-carbon or enhancements to biodiversity. The plan is woefully unambitious and does not commit to any level of sustainability in its targets. The proposed plan has clearly prioritised house building growth and money/construction companies over considerations for the very real climate emergency we all face.</p>

Several local authorities in England (e.g., Greater Cambridge, Reading and Liverpool City) have developed integrated local plans that take account of climate change, biodiversity, well-being and social inclusion. Beyond some hyperbole, there is no evidence in the proposed Local Plan of any viable action to deliver such an approach.

We must ensure the Local Plan commits to all new homes to be certified zero carbon and sustainable in order to address the climate emergency.

I, along with many of my fellow Tring residents call for the number of new houses proposed in the plan to be substantially reduced, and that the following comments are considered.

- The number of houses proposed to be built at the Station end of Tring Station are being built on a Green Belt flood plain (in particular near Ivy Cottage and along the expanse of field running alongside the Canal) - this should be revised and appropriate flood prevention plans incorporated.

- The houses to be built are in a large number disproportionate to the local community and feel of an ancient Chilterns Market Town.

- The provisions and amenities are not available to support such numbers of houses. The Station is already full in peak hours with cars and people, expanding the station will be unsightly and unacceptable alongside AONB of Ashridge and the Ridgeway, the infrastructure for transport is not there. Neither is drainage, schools, doctors or other amenities. Adding amenities specifically for the new build area will disconnect the new build area further from the existing town and likely cause a problematic and fragmented community.

- The fields proposed are some of the only green spaces available to local families and children, they are currently used by a large proportion of the community for recreational activity along the footpaths and removing that provision will lead to a significant change in the way people, in particular, young people from the centre of town are able to enjoy their leisure time.

The plan must also improve in terms of its green credentials and sustainability as follows:

- Dacorum to implement a local plan that includes firm and ambitious sustainable commitments. I believe all new buildings should be designed to meet the highest externally certified sustainability standards and to be at least net-zero carbon (including Scope 3 emissions). Examples include: Every property with a parking space to have an electric vehicle charger built into it. Every property to have a dual aspect to allow for natural ventilation. All new homes must incorporate solar PVs and other appropriate sustainable sources. No new building should be directly reliant on fossil fuels for heating (i.e. no gas boilers) and each home should collect rain water for toilets. The homes must have top class insulation. These standards should be mandatory for all developers in the Local Plan.
- I call for the 40% minimum affordable homes objective to be enforced across the Borough. Too often developers in the past have been allowed to waive their affordable homes commitments.
- Trees and woodland are very valuable to the environment and the community's physical and mental health. I welcome the commitment in the plan to retain existing trees but in order to compensate for any removal of green belt it is vital that we seek a commitment that new mixed woodland and re-wilding, with public access, be planted close to, and be integral to, each new major development area.



- An increase in habitat for wildlife must be incorporated into any green field development areas including wildlife corridors.
- Recreational corridors should be incorporated within new built-up areas to promote cycling and pedestrian access through the development and provide connectivity with the existing town and the countryside boundaries. These routes should not be limited to narrow, dark alleyways but should be several metres wide with natural vegetation to make travelling pleasantly airy and to support bio-diversity.
- The Local Plan should allocate land for new allotments for residents of new homes as well as laying out gardens to support 'Growing your own'(which is both sustainable and good for mental health)
- Public transport must be greatly improved both to connect these new homes to their town centres but also to reduce traffic congestion on the roads which cannot be widened. Well connected and maintained dedicated cycle routes throughout our towns must be implemented along with secure bike storage.
- Transport networks must be improved to local area and to city centres - cycle network, bike and car parking at the station, and public transport amenities.

We are facing a climate emergency and addressing this must be at the absolute core of Dacorum's Local Plan. Currently it is not. We have the knowledge and technology to make good affordable zero carbon sustainable homes. The Local Plan must prioritise this.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7263

**Person ID** 1261685

**Full Name** Ian Edwards

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Disproportional housing increase. Brook Street proposal for retail would cause traffic chaos on the narrow roads in that area. Throw that idea out immediately!

Not convinced about the employment opportunities for Tring.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7265
<b>Person ID</b>	1265164
<b>Full Name</b>	J. Reading
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see my comment in section 24.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7271
<b>Person ID</b>	1265168
<b>Full Name</b>	Jo Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	1) The proposals for Tr02 and Tr03 are excessive in scale for a development with a stated goal of being 'compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character' of a small market town. Considerations around supporting infrastructure (roads in particular) and mitigating Green Belt loss are insufficiently developed.

2) NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces – there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key ‘honey pots’ of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.

3) The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum requires developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and there is little to no evidence that this has been given meaningful consideration for Tring.

4) Throughout the Plan there is confusion between what constitutes green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors and lack of explicit requirements around wildlife corridors, hedgerows and buffer zones (DBC Urban Nature Study maps; Tring. Herts Biological Records Centre 2005/6).

5) The Plan must be more explicit on matters relating to Hertfordshire’s Sustainability Strategy and the priorities defined by the HCCSP – in particular, there is a clear opportunity to mandate the highest possible standards for renewable energy use, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity.

6) There are too many caveats and vagueness of intent for a Plan proposing such significant impact on the character of the town and surroundings.

7) There is an absence of even approximate timelines for the proposed developments, by site.

#### **Section 23.139 ‘Introduction’**

There is no published infrastructure plan and personal experience suggests when this is left to developers to deliver it is often late and/or lacking.

#### **Section 23.143 ‘Tring Homes’**

There are no objectives around retaining and/or building on the distinctiveness of Tring especially given the sizable scale of growth proposed for Tring. This is counter to the vision / strategic objectives as mentioned above. The objectives are also not explicit enough about the importance of green/climate/environment issues.

Will we really need a further secondary school?

There are no commitments to maintaining local wildlife habitats despite the growth - as mentioned by others this is not the same as provision of green / leisure spaces.

There appears to have been little thought regarding expanding the road infrastructure in Tring to accommodate the extra load. The comment ‘*secure the delivery of a local north-south distributor road between Bulbourne Road and London Road*’ seems aspirational and does not account for other pinch points within Tring such as Brook Street, Cow Lane, Station Road/London Road junction and the Bulbourne Road/Icknield Way junction. The lack of mention/analysis of traffic from the north of Tring are a real concern. How can the plans proceed without more detail here?

#### **Section 23.149 ‘Tring Employment’**

Warehousing should be removed as an option and a modest maximum industrial building size established. This does not offer sensible employment prospects for Tring and will lead to greater heavy traffic and pollution. It also detracts from

the distinctiveness of the town. Surely this would be better sited in one of the existing sites on the A41 and in conjunction with Aylesbury Vale District Council. Generally

I strongly object to the creation of an expanded industrial space for Dunsley Farm . This is unwarranted and again is likely to impact the distinctive nature of Tring town centre. Why isn't there a focus on expanding the existing larger industrial units at the west end of Tring or at Bulbourne? Also, I understand this goes back to 2017 when the proposed development of Tring was much smaller and are no longer fully valid or appropriate. A 5+hectare industrial estate at Dunsley Farm is likely to concentrate more traffic on a centre that will struggle to cope.

### **Section 23.150 'Tring Retail'**

There is no mention of how the plan will explicitly support new forms of public transport.

As mentioned previously I just do not understand how the recommendations for Tr06 and Tr01 meet the needs of the plan. They do not minimise the impact on Tring in terms of movement and do not help with enhancing the distinctiveness of Tring town.

Traditional, food-oriented supermarket space on Tr06 no longer makes sense either in terms of scale or location (especially from an access and traffic standpoint).

The alternative Tr01 proposal is also no longer appropriate – it is sub-optimal for developments in Tr02 and most of Tr03, inconveniently located and needlessly adding to traffic.

Regarding additional retail space in Tr06, Tring has a long history as a market town and significant success with the growth of the Farmers' Market. Modern social trends point to a clear opportunity for a permanent, modern, 'destination' food and leisure facility. This could be made more accessible from the High Street by moving the entrance/exit of the Forge Car Park to Brook Street and using that space for retail development instead.

### **Section 23.152 'Tring Movement'**

I think this section severely underestimates the likely congestion as a consequence of the proposed growth, '*With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street ...Tring does not suffer significant [traffic] problems*'. This is just wrong as the the High Street is frequently congested with large tailbacks and this will be exacerbated with additional traffic especially with further centrally located supermarkets / industrial estates.

The Sustainable Transport Strategy does not appear to have projected the associated numbers and this cannot be a sensible way to move forward. This should truly understand the impact of additional traffic on Tring centre including parking and other such issues including the ability of the local rail infrastructure supporting the increased commuter load. Peak trains are already very busy and parking at Tring Station limited after 8am.

### **Policy SP23 – Delivering Growth in Tring**

As mentioned previously '*at least*' 2731 dwellings appears to be untenable in the current plan especially as there is no timescale given for any of the numbers (overall or by site), and yet these must exist as the overall growth for Dacorum is profiled by year.

I would like to see the following changes:

- Tr01 – State any employment space is via small units or office space and a smaller number of residential dwellings to minimise impact on Tring centre.
- Tr06 – To categorically NOT include reference to a supermarket and NOT still be considering multi-level developments including retail, office and/or housing – it is not in keeping with Tring’s character, distracts from better use of the site and does not take into account the implications of Tr02/03 expansion.
- Tr02/03 expansion curtailed significantly for reasons mentioned previously.
- Impact on local utilities further developed especially in terms of energy and water – I believe that there will be a substantial impact on local water supplies with the proposed growth based on feedback from Thames Water.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7284

**Person ID** 1265162

**Full Name** Anne Robets

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I support new housing in Tring, but not on this scale. This proposal will destroy a large area of green belt and will completely change the character of Tring. It is likely that the new houses will be marketed as convenient for the M25 and mainline train into London. The station car park cannot cope with any additional cars. Station Road and Cow Lane are already very busy with commuter traffic. If this housing goes ahead the developer must be required to organise reliable public transport to the station. If new schools are built they must be separate to Tring school Ridgeway Learning Partnership to allow parents to choose non religious education for their children.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7290

**Person ID** 1265179

<b>Full Name</b>	JANE DAWSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7321
<b>Person ID</b>	1265211
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr N Monro
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I live in Tring, where a suggested expansion of up to 60% more houses is quite irresponsible. The single school is already oversubscribed and some friends' children have had to be educated some miles away in Aylesbury instead; I assume Berkhamsted schools are similarly overloaded. Traffic in Berkhamsted and Tring (in non-lockdown times) is quite appalling. Also healthcare provision for the area has been reduced, with Hemel Hospital being downgraded and limited in scope.</p> <p>Much development has happened in recent years including several town centre offices being converted to apartments, and many brownfield sites in Dacorum area have housing developments too. This process appears not to have been acknowledged, instead the facile solution of mass development of our precious green belt is put forward.</p> <p>I look forward to your comments and anticipate that the local plan will be rejected in favour of more sympathetic expansion where needed.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7323
<b>Person ID</b>	1265324
<b>Full Name</b>	Michaela Brimson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My name is Michaela Brimson I am opposed to the the plans (2020-2038) and to all the new housing going to be built. (Address removed)</p> <p>These are the reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 You are planning on building an enormous amount of homes without adequate new infrastructure; where are the new doctors surgeries? Hospitals and schools? What about all the new cars on the road? Not to mention the need for new sewage systems.</li> <li>1 These housing targets are based on old models. There is also a 55 percent increase compared to 20 percent increases in neighbouring towns this is disproportionate.</li> <li>1 An increase in this size will totally change the character of the town and the reason why people love it in the first place.</li> <li>1 And most importantly it's green belt land that you will build on. This should be protected, what about the environmental impact this will have for future generations?</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7329
<b>Person ID</b>	864107
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Antony Hetherington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7340
<b>Person ID</b>	1207259
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Graham Bright
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Grove Fields Resident Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p> <p>I've referenced the Infrastructure Delivery Plan below against this question - Question 4, if my response would be better located against a different question please do so on my behalf.</p> <p>Page 2 - "The infrastructure delivery lead, cost estimates and funding mechanism will be identified where possible. The funding gap between identified funding stream and total estimated cost of infrastructure to support growth will be identified." This work still needs to be completed therefore the plan is not ready for consultation.</p>

Page 2 - "This draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan is not at this stage a complete or comprehensive IDP." This work still needs to be completed therefore the plan is not ready for consultation. Page 154 - Key issues for the Tring include:

"High reliance on the private car (43% car journeys to work).

Additional housing could result in capacity issues at Tring Station car park New housing could result in more locally generated car trips.

Limited opportunities for development within the town given strong existing local and historic character.

Increasing primary school capacity issues as forecast by the County Council Schools and Education Service equivalent of 0.9 FE by 2021/22. Increasing secondary school capacity issues as forecast by the County Council Schools and Education Service equivalent of 1.4 FE by 2027/28. Potential under capacity of existing local infrastructure such as dentists and health surgeries.

New development could harm the setting of the Chilterns AONB, the Grand Union Canal and other interests of acknowledged importance."

The cost of addressing these issues has not been determined and nor have DBC or HCC committed to providing the funding to address these issues. They have only provided a figure for the quantum of developer contributions that will be made - this is not the same as developing a budget to address the issues.

Page 155 - There are about £3M of sustainable travel improvements required that need to be funded by Herts CC. Has this been committed to?

Page 156 - Provides the developer contributions (£80M build programme for infrastructure) but not the cost of delivering the infrastructure i.e. has the cost of delivering the infrastructure in this plan actually been estimated? It looks to me that DBC has only provided figures for the amount of developer contribution that will be provided rather than the estimated costs of building the infrastructure. If this is the case then the plan is not ready for consultation because DBC has provided no evidence that they have enough funds to deliver the proposed infrastructure in the plan.

There have been no visible assessments made of either of the two A41 junctions at Tring to assess the impact of a 55% increase in traffic journeys on congestion at these major roundabout junctions. Are DBC assuming that these extra journeys on the A41 (either London bound or Aylesbury bound) will be made by bicycle and on foot like the assumption of the 55% increase in journeys within Tring. Without a proper assessment of the A41 junctions the local plan is not ready for consultation.

Has the impact of new housing developments (through the duty to cooperate) along the A41 in Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire been assessed by Highways England for the major junction of the A41 with the M25. This junction is already congested without increasing the population of Dacorum by 25% and without the increases in population planned for Aylesbury. Without a proper assessment of this major junction the local plan is not ready for consultation.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7362

**Person ID** 398666

**Full Name** Ms Sheila Godden

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Please accept this as strong objections to the proposed planning for Tring

I have lived in Tring for over 50 years and have seen Tring grow tremendously. We have already reached the stage where we do not have the right infrastructure for the number of residents in Tring. All amenities are beyond stretching point so how do you expect Tring to cope with even more people. Local Hospitals, Doctors, Dentists, Schools, Shops, Parking are all unable to accommodate the people already here. There is no logic to the new proposals.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7371

**Person ID** 1265362

**Full Name** ROSEMARY NORTH

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am responding by email as I your website is not allowing me to submit comments.</p> <p>Whilst I realise that there is a great need in Dacorum for affordable housing, the projected sites for housing in both Berkhamsted and Tring are well away from the town centres, which will necessitate travel by car. There is already a lack of adequate parking spaces in both towns.</p> <p>Why is there a proposal to put a new supermarket on the Dunsley Farm site when there is a large Tesco opposite? Another supermarket should be located to the east of Tring where new housing is proposed. However, putting housing in that area will significantly detract from the currant rural views in an area of AONB. Brownfield sites should be used instead of cutting into the Green Belt, which should only be touched in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The plan does not clearly explain in what ways Dacorum Council will mitigate Green Belt loss and meet the County's goals for climate change and carbon reduction. Where will car charging points be located? Currently there are only a few located in car parks in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Only one new school is proposed for Berkhamsted, on the west side of the town. However, on the south side there are major housing development proposals and Swing gate School and Thomas Coram School are both currently full.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7375
<b>Person ID</b>	1263887
<b>Full Name</b>	Atherton Powell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have read the proposed housing expansion plan for East Tring and I am horrified by the prospects. These are my reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 This area is precious green belt land, protecting the ancient lands designated as AONB in the Chiltern Hills.</li> <li>1 This development will put unsupportable pressure on our already stressed local infrastructure and natural resources.</li> <li>1 The foundation of the plan appears to be based on a flawed, outdated and universally discredited central government algorithm.</li> <li>1 Tring will be radically changed by this development- for the worse. What is currently a small town with a strong sense of community and local focus will become a sprawling suburb. The last thing everyone needs is a new version of Aylesbury. Why destroy what we all currently love only to cover it over with a problem that is then sold to innocent new home owners?</li> </ul> <p>Please please resist and rethink these plans before a disaster unfolds.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7406
<b>Person ID</b>	1265377
<b>Full Name</b>	PHILIP MOORES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7416
<b>Person ID</b>	1265379
<b>Full Name</b>	P Reynard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I cannot understand your policy of building a such a huge amount of housing in Tring. This seems against government policy of building in cities and not small rural towns.</p> <p>The use of so much green belt land will ruin Tring as well as destroying land which should be used for growing food crops, which in our present circumstances as a country will be much needed.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Tring is already overstretched and would not cope with the influx of hundreds more people. The type of houses which would be built are too expensive for many people--not the sort that young people can afford.</p> <p>We are going to end up with a conurbation stretching from Aylesbury through to Hemel Hempstead!! This is all wrong.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7420
<b>Person ID</b>	1265380
<b>Full Name</b>	JON WRIGHT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to



Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7432

**Person ID** 1265381

**Full Name** DR SUE DAVEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7445
<b>Person ID</b>	1265383
<b>Full Name</b>	RUTH NEWCOMBE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I strongly object to the proposal of some 3400 new homes to be built around the small peaceful village of Long Marston.

Having been a resident of Long Marston for over 17 years now I have seen an increase of traffic through our village that the road system simply can't cope with.

The roads are constantly peppered with potholes from large lorries that the roads cannot take and the speed at which traffic travels through is simply not safe.

I live on the cross roads opposite the pub and the amount of cars abusing the long straight roads in and out of the village is ridiculous.

The roads in and out of the village can hardly cope with the lorries coming through on a daily basis up to the airfield, there is categorically no capacity for any more, which a development of this size would bring in spades.

I have seen the village flood numerous times, how can it cope with another 3400 homes??

The school is not big enough to accommodate more children and the parking at school run times is already mad enough.

The village has one small pub, and no other facilities. The church would not be able to cope with extra people either.

The village would be irreversibly changed for the worse, ultimately turning it in to a town.

There simply isn't enough in the area to cope with such a huge development.

It would inevitably devalue all the properties in the village too.

I urge you to consider the lives of the residents of Long Marston and think how it would affect you if this was proposed on your doorstep.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7456
<b>Person ID</b>	1265397
<b>Full Name</b>	Marie Austen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to object to points Tr01 – Tr06. We understand that the need for extra housing, but increasing Tring by 55% is simply a mad idea. I believe that an increase of around 20% is the most that Tring could absorb.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7457
<b>Person ID</b>	1265397
<b>Full Name</b>	Marie Austen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Working on that assumption , any new houses should show Tring to be an exemplary eco friendly town, with zero carbon emission houses, using solar panels, air source and geothermal heating, electricity storage, rain water recycling, heat exchange , etc like, for example, Gamlingay in Cambridgeshire. Houses should also cover all ranges, from first time buyers upwards and not just be as many houses as the developers can cram in.

More houses means more families and so, to prevent Tring becoming a dormitory town, increased services (including schools and doctors' surgeries) need to be provided as well as greater leisure and sport place - the existing sports centre is old and inadequate, and teenagers and younger children in Tring have little that they can do. It would be good to see an outdoor sport leisure complex like a water park for little ones in summer which could be doubled as an ice rink in winter for older children and adults.

Cycle paths are a great idea because apart from the existing (and in bad condition) one going to the station, there aren't any others. If Tring increase its population, cycling on the roads are certainly not an option for families as too dangerous.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7476

**Person ID** 1263129

**Full Name** Elizabeth Norton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We are writing to set out our objections to the plans for Tring.

The current proposals are both excessive and inappropriate. A 55% increase in housing in Tring is completely unrealistic and unacceptable. Such an increase would destroy the character of the town and overwhelm the local infrastructure. Large swathes of green belt land will be destroyed in an area of outstanding natural beauty.

The massive increase in housing over the plans originally conceived in the 1980s is neither adequately explained or justified. The plans take no account of 21st century needs in terms of types of housing, design or construction and in a post-COVID world both housing, retail and business needs should be reassessed - particularly as the plans are based on the discredited housing target algorithm and the 2014 rather than 2018 ONS housing estimates.

Any new development should be much smaller, reflect 21st century sustainable housing needs and be limited to the Dunsley Farm area.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7485
<b>Person ID</b>	1265554
<b>Full Name</b>	P CHARLESWORTH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As residents of Tring we would like to register our strong opposition on the Dacorum Local Plan, specifically in relation to Tring.</p> <p>We are aware that according to planning policy, Green Belt land should only be developed in exceptional circumstances and we do not see any explanation in the Local Plan showing what these specific exceptional circumstances apply to. The proposal is neither sustainable or justifiable and at odds with the Core Strategy vision statement.</p> <p>The strategy suggested, places a large number of houses where there is little employment, therefore increasing traffic flows as workers will be required to travel to employment increasing pollution which is at odds with current environmental goals and essential if we are to tackle the</p> <p>The numbers of properties proposed are excessive, especially as there is a large unfinished housing development known as Roman Gardens which will soon increase the strain on Trings infastructure when new residents move-in. Adding to this, the Local Plans proposed additional large housing developments would have a profound effect on the town of Tring, requiring significant investment in infrastructure if it is not to over-whelm the existing local services for which there seems to be insufficient advance planning.</p> <p>Tring is a historic Market Town and increasing the number of households by over 50% would change the nature and feel of the town for the worse, increasing traffic congestion, and, as there is restricted space in the town centre no additional open-space to facilitate appropriate car parking.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7487
<b>Person ID</b>	1265556
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sarah Jane Potter
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring Development</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed building plans fro Tring and the proposed sites fro the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You Plan to build 2,700 Plus new houses as well as make changes to our quiet country roads and various services.</li> </ul> <p>This will cause detrimental damage and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the size of Tring by 55% more households.</li> <li>• Destroying the character of the town - replacing much of it with a generic, clone-like and unsympathetic, developer led sprawl.</li> <li>• Destroy much of Tring's surroundings and Green Belt:</li> <li>• Uproot ancient hedgerows and trees, including Marshcroft Lane.</li> <li>• Negatively impacting the quality of our countryside, wildlife and environment.</li> <li>• Needlessly increase Tring's carbon footprint:</li> <li>• Bringing more cars (almost 6000!) and lorries to our roads.</li> <li>• Missing opportunities to improve energy efficiency in new builds.</li> </ul> <p>I have reviewed the Local Plan in detail and found many areas of serious concern.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7543
<b>Person ID</b>	1145685
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Moira Graham

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We currently have a 12,000 population in Tring and the friendly market town is already full. We have building at the end of our road and together with the proposed sites across the area, there appears to be a total of nearly 2,300 houses being built, infill housing does not appear to be included in these proposals. The national average of house occupancy is 2.4 but I think the types of houses proposed will be higher than this. Working on 2.4 there will be an increase of about 5,500 people, which is almost a 50% increase in the current population. I'm sure there will not be a 50% increase in schools, policing, doctors, hospitals, train station (commuting trains and car parking have been full for years) and all the other trades and services in Tring. The proposals are way out of proportion to this lovely town and so much green belt has already been used or earmarked for development.</p> <p>We object most strongly to this proposal.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7559
<b>Person ID</b>	1263717
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Wells
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>TRING</b>



I am sure that inhabitants of other towns and villages in the borough are better qualified than I to speak about their local area, but as a resident of Tring, I wish to state my objections to the current plan and to offer some suggestions as to the manner in which I think it can be improved.

,

## OBJECTIONS TO CURRENT PLAN

### 1 Facilities

- 1 A 55% increase in housing will alter the entire character of an historic market town. Why has the Council decided that Tring should bear the brunt of this development?
- 1 The town's infrastructure is not capable of sustaining such a large increase in population. I note that the plan does make provision for potential new schools, but many other services are required.
- 1 Car-parking for High Street shopping is at a premium and is one of the factors in the decline of facilities in the town centre. The Council are naïve if they believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities.
- 1 The proposed re-development of the Fire Station and Auction area will exacerbate the car-parking problems. Even Tesco's large car-park is sometimes totally full.
- 1 Most of the proposed housing is distant from the High Street. The surrounding roads are narrow and any further traffic will only add to the present congestion.

The Council are naïve if they believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities, especially as the eastern development is distant from the town centre.

- 1 There is a lack of local employment – most new residents are going to be commuters. It is obvious that the proposed employment facilities will be inadequate to cater for the vastly increased population.
- 1 Car-parking at the station is also limited; indeed the Station Car-Park's own web-site states that even season-ticket holders cannot be guaranteed a parking place after 8 a.m. Many people from surrounding villages use the station

and , owing to the car-parking charges, there is a growing tendency for commuters to park in the Grove residential area, thereby causing considerable inconvenience to residents.

## 1 Environmental concerns

- 1 The proposed housing to the east of the town is on Green Belt land. The Chilterns are an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the sheer size of the development will have a serious detrimental effect on a beautiful environment, impacting on valuable farming land.

The Government, in addition to its policy of focusing housing in the Midlands and North, has announced that it would now be prioritising brownfield sites and urban areas - not Green Belt.

- 1 The Covid crisis has only emphasised the value of green spaces for exercise and leisure to improve mental health. The areas between the town and the canal, especially Marshcroft Lane, are in almost constant use by dog-walkers, cyclists and hikers.

### Included files

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7573

**Person ID** 1265607

**Full Name** Victoria Hayes

### Organisation Details

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I understand that the borough requires more housing but am not in a position to comment on the scope of the local plan. However I have read in Appendix F of the Dacorum local plan interim sustainability appraisal report appendices -November 2020 that a development of over 3500 houses is being considered on the outskirts of Long Marston.</p> <p>In my view there are three main reasons why this is not a suitable site for a development of this size.</p> <p>Firstly, the surrounding transport infrastructure struggles to cope with the existing number of vehicles. The crossroads in Long Marston becomes congested especially during rush hour and at school times. This is exacerbated by the large vehicles coming through the village en route to and from the airfield industrial estate on Cheddington Lane. This would be the route taken to Cheddington station, the proximity of which is mentioned as a mitigating factor in reducing the number of car journeys. The road into Wingrave is very narrow in places and would not be suitable for a large number of additional vehicles.</p> <p>Secondly, Long Marston has an ongoing issue with flooding. Much of the village has had several days without mains drainage already this year and two households have been out of their homes since October after a flooding event. Both properties have had water in again since. If much of our surrounding countryside is built on then the volume of water running into the centre of the village is going to increase. The fields hold a lot of water during the winter and are very boggy underfoot.</p> <p>Lastly, the impact on the local wildlife would be atrocious. Personally I have seen two species of deer, hares and many different insects and birds in this area over the last year. Destruction of their habitat would be an extremely sad loss for Long Marston and the whole of Dacorum.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7579
<b>Person ID</b>	1265614
<b>Full Name</b>	JACKIE BARKER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7607

**Person ID** 1143218

**Full Name** Mr Terry Cartmell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7639
<b>Person ID</b>	1265748
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Roger McVey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7653
<b>Person ID</b>	1265752
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Flora Moores
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7673
<b>Person ID</b>	1261784
<b>Full Name</b>	Nigel Vanner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7694
<b>Person ID</b>	1265761
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Chalmers
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am generally in favour of some development especially the provision of affordable housing to allow young families to stay in their home town and villages. However I have to strongly object to the sheer number of houses being proposed for both Tring and in Long Marston.</p> <p>I am perturbed that building is going to take place on green belt land and in an area where the roads are just not suitable for such a huge increase in traffic. Whoever wrote the proposal for Tring and made the suggestion that there is no problem with the through flow in the High Street, quite clearly does not live in Tring and has plainly not spent any time at all there otherwise they would know that there is always a problem with traffic flow through the High Street, one parked delivery van causes chaos on a daily basis.</p> <p>As for 1400 new houses outside Long Marston, again the roads are just not suitable for such an increase in traffic. Long Marston has major problems now with bottlenecks at the Queens Head junction and there are hump back bridges going into Tring. I think there was also a suggestion that people could cycle to Cheddington Station! Well, again, whoever proposed that has no idea of the distance to the station and the dangerous state of the roads now there is now let alone with a potential increase of nearly 3,000 more cars.</p> <p>I would ask Dacorum to revisit these plans and scale them down considerably to a more manageable number and to utilise brownfield sites rather than build on our beautiful countryside.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7698
<b>Person ID</b>	1265614
<b>Full Name</b>	JACKIE BARKER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p>

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7712

**Person ID** 1265765

**Full Name** Miss Inma Rodriguez

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7728

**Person ID** 1265775

**Full Name** Chris Earnshaw

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my objection to the Dacorum local plan, particularly relating to the disproportionate number of houses proposed in Tring without clear planning or capacity for sufficient infrastructure along with destruction of green belt land. I am not opposed to the growth of the town and hope that a more appropriate increase in population would benefit local businesses, but feel the number of houses being proposed is disproportionate and not sensible for Tring's small and basic amenities, including the very narrow high street that is already potentially dangerous when walking with young children and would be even worse with a 55% increase in cars and buses.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7770
<b>Person ID</b>	1265887
<b>Full Name</b>	Will Yates
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Tring, Hertfordshire I and my family must strongly voice our opposition to the proposed residential housing expansion plan for our town and I would like to briefly outline why this plan should not be approved.</p> <p>Tring has a charm that is bound up with it being a small town bordering on the Chilterns and to allow the Housing Growth Proposal as part of the Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038 will be woefully detrimental. It is less for aesthetic concerns - though the environmental damage caused by tearing up precious greenbelt will be significant and irreversible - that I and my family are resistant to the notion of continued building. Rather, it is the severely adverse impact more houses with vehicles and people will have on Tring's already strained infrastructure.</p> <p>To be sure, the proposed building will blight the local landscape and cause appalling levels of motor congestion. The plan proposes an extensive building to the east and northern end of Tring to the south of Bulbourne Road and east of Grive Road. These roads in particular are already narrow, Grove Road has speed reduction bumps and further down, Marshcroft Lane (which will surely be used for access is single lane only and a popular route for walkers and cyclists). There is no way in logic or common sense that any of these roads could ever cope with the number of cars that would accompany hundreds of new houses on this proposed plot of land. It will be a similar issue with the houses planned south of Marshcroft and north of Station Road, the latter of which in particular, while only slightly wider, is already a busy road and not well suited to an increase in traffic.</p> <p>Similarly, Tring's schools are at capacity and an influx of people inhabiting new homes will only exacerbate this issue. Primary schools in Tring are now having an excess of 30 pupils per class, and while this is not a problem exclusive to our town, increasing the population will lead to poorer educational outcomes. While Tring's secondary school is undergoing renovation and expansion, it is already one of the largest in the whole of Hertfordshire and has a large catchment - hundreds more pupils will again be only a recipe for a lowering of educational standards.</p>

Numerous surrounding towns, such as Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted are spoilt by density of population. Streets are choked with cars encroaching pavements, driving is nightmarish and slow because the roads can simply not cope with the traffic. School places are difficult to get and teachers are becoming burnt out. This awful pattern will be replicated IF your proposed building in Tring is allowed to go ahead. What is needed is a separate, fresh new town in a new area, rather than intensely overcrowding existing settlements. For these reasons, and others, we oppose the new proposed building plans.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7811

**Person ID** 1265909

**Full Name** Peter Evans

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I strongly object to the plan to allocate 55% of housing growth to Tring. The expected growth in Dacorum is actually 9% according to the ONS and even if overall 25% increase can be shown to be necessary, it should not be disproportionately placed in one town or area. Although the plan suggests that some areas are unsuitable due to their lack of infrastructure, the same assessment does not seem to have taken place in Tring.

Exceptional evidence is required to justify the use of Green Belt land for housing in Tring (i.e proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03) and this has not been shown.

Significant and irreversible harm would be caused to the openness of Green Belt and AONB and to the biodiversity within it. The Council has not shown that this harm is balanced by collective benefits and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft polices SP23 and Sp24 on this basis.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated

with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum is for developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and to protect and enhance the historical environment. There is little evidence that this strategy has been applied to proposed developments in Tring.

The Plan should be explicit in requiring developers to use the highest standards for renewable energy, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity.

I strongly disagree with the idea that the existing people of Tring will gain incrementally greater benefit from larger and larger developments. There is no justification or supporting evidence for this within the Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7815

**Person ID** 1265909

**Full Name** Peter Evans

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Whatever evidence might show of housing need, the council hasn't shown evidence that brownfield land and/or land that is not within the Green Belt in Tring has been assessed to meet any housing requirement. It also hasn't shown the Duty to Cooperate of consulting with other adjacent Local Planning Authorities in relation to this local plan. Irrespective of the housing requirement it hasn't therefore identified exceptional circumstances to justify the use of Green Belt land.

Tring is bounded on two sides by Buckinghamshire. Their plans will impact hugely on employment, traffic, local land use within and across boundaries. The council have said they will need to demonstrate they have satisfied the Duty to Cooperate by the time the Local Plan is submitted for examination. This shows that the council is not using the Duty to Cooperate to inform their planning strategy along with cross boundary councils, rather seeing it as a tick list exercise after the event.

The plans for building in Tring are not compatible with protecting and enhancing the distinctive landscape, open land, biological and geological diversity in Tring. They would destroy the natural landscape in different parts of the town, including Green Belt and land surrounded by the Chilterns AONB.

The areas of Tr01, Tr02, Tr03 p are of important value for for wildlife and biodiversity as well as important sites for human recreation and wellbeing. Particularly in the current Climate Emergency, and global threats to biodiversity these important areas should be preserved for current and future generations. The plans appear to confuse and conflate new sports and leisure open spaces with open countryside and wildlife corridors. The loss of the latter cannot be mitigated against with the former. Wherever possible wildlife corridors, ancient hedgerows and trees should be preserved and enhanced.

Building a major road junction on Cow Lane and two new major road junctions on the London Road in Tring will cause serious environmental harm to wildlife and humans through pollution, noise, and congestion. Potentially building a road across an important wildlife corridor (Marshcroft Lane) will undoubtedly cause destruction of wildlife habitats and biodiversity.

The plan mentions the risk to Ashridge estate SSSI and Stubbings Wood of increased population and visitor numbers but gives inadequate assessment of these. I believe that the impact of local traffic increase, pollution and visitor numbers would have a very negative impact on these sites and that of Tring Park SSSI. The impact of these should be considered alongside housing need. Government policy seems clear that councils have responsibilities for assessing housing need alongside local environmental concerns rather than the former trumping the latter.

I concur with the need for a network of cycle paths and would have liked to see more detail of proposals for these. They need to be well connected and integrated into any new development. Lighting should be at a low level to minimise effects on birds, insects and mammals.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7816
<b>Person ID</b>	1265909
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Infrastructure**

The vision within the Local Plan of thousands of new homes being added to perimeters of Tring (and Berkhamsted) and using Green Belt land is not backed up with adequate assessment of the pressures on water supplies, tra□c, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements). There is little sustainable about the construction nor preserving of our heritage about this plan.

Tring is bounded on two sides by Buckinghamshire. Their plans will impact hugely on employment, tra□c, local land use etc. It's very important as the cross boundary impacts of changes in infrastructure are immense. Plans could certainly change in response, for example there is lots of warehousing very local along the A41 and its very unclear that more is needed within Tring itself.

The wish to look at increasing bus routes and numbers may be one way to ease some of large increase in tra□c that this plan would create but a clear commitment is needed for this. Sustainable modern transport connections are mentioned but concrete requirements not given. Public transport must be greatly improved both to connect new homes to their town centres but also to reduce tra□c congestion on the roads which cannot be widened.

Well connected and maintained dedicated cycle routes throughout our towns must be implemented along with secure bike storage. Recreational corridors should be incorporated within new built-up areas to promote cycling and pedestrian access through the development and provide connectivity with the existing town and the countryside boundaries. These routes should not be limited to narrow, dark alleyways but should be several metres wide with natural vegetation to make travelling pleasantly airy and to support bio-diversity.

The plan suggests that 3 new schools are needed within Tring because of the increase in housing. However the plan also seems to suggest the reverse has taken place - that a secondary school within Tring is desired and therefore it should be paid for/justified by building lots of houses! The idea for two further primary schools and as secondary is based on the premise of the large number of houses and isn't likely to be necessary, unless far more evidence is given for this requirement.

New roads in the area will hugely increase congestion, pollution and impact on biodiversity. They would adversely affect the wellbeing and quality of life of both human and wildlife populations.

Building a new supermarket near to the existing Tescos in Tring will not offer local people what they need and will add to the congestion and pollution in the area. The development of the existing markets within Tring offer employment opportunities to locals, and a more sustainable model for local food and produce.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7818

**Person ID** 1265909

**Full Name** Peter Evans

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Character of Tring/Local distinctiveness</p> <p>An overarching strategy for development in Dacorum is that developments are distinctive to the local settlement. This aim is not carried through into the actual plans, in particular for Tring which is earmarked for massive expansion and loss of important green spaces.</p> <p>Tring is often described as a ‘town that thinks it’s a village’. It is a historic market town sited in the middle of important AONB’s, SSSI’s and Green Belt land. The plans for building in Tring are not compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character of the town. They would destroy the natural landscape in different parts of the town, including Green Belt and land surrounded by the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>The areas of Tr01, Tr02, Tr03 p are of important value for human recreation and wellbeing as well as important sites for wildlife and biodiversity. Particularly in the current Climate Emergency, and global threats to wildlife these important areas should be preserved for current and future generations.</p> <p>Building a major road junction on Cow Lane and two new major road junctions on the London Road in Tring will cause serious environmental harm to wildlife and humans through pollution, noise, and congestion. Potentially building a road across an important wildlife corridor (Marshcroft Lane) will undoubtedly cause destruction of wildlife habitats and biodiversity.</p> <p>I do not believe that a second supermarket close to the current Tescos would be of any benefit to residents of Tring and would add to congestion and pollution across Tring and villages around it. I agree with Tring in Transition that this would be better sited nearer to Bulbourne to provide better access for residents in that part of Tring.</p> <p>Similarly, Tring is a rural market town and not a suitable place for an industrial area, as planned for TR01. As above, warehousing and industrial sites are to be found very locally on the A41 and this should be part of the Duty to Cooperate discussions with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire.</p> <p>The idea that existing residents and visitors to Tring would gain greater benefit from larger and larger developments are not justified in the plan or any supporting evidence. I strongly disagree with this proposition.</p> <p>The plan could and should recognise what makes Tring distinctive. The plan should be as proactive in improving our surroundings as it is in adding new houses.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7823
<b>Person ID</b>	1264850
<b>Full Name</b>	LES WICKS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having read the documents related to Tring I believe you have done your best to bury the full extent of the changes planned for Tring - The plan for Tring is incoherent based on the massive growth in housing of 55%, it is inconceivable that any town could accommodate such a rapid increase in population, the damage to the area would not be recoverable and in essence it will change the character of the town that exists today. The area seems to be disproportionately affected, when compared with other areas across the UK, no explanation is given on how the methodology for determining Dacorum's, Tring's, target.</p> <p>The plan for new infrastructure is weak and points only to major arteries not to local roads and transport links - local infrastructure is weak now the issues will be much worse if the plans for the area from Station Road to Bulbourne is allowed to go ahead without amendment.</p> <p>The approach to wellbeing and exercise is inadequate and fails to take account of the increase in the local population and the age profile of the area - it is quite ridiculous that a town of the size proposed does not have its own sports centre will full size swimming pool, with more indoor courts, and more all-weather outdoor facilities. The plan for walking, cycling and other increasingly popular pastimes is vague at best. We have extensive chalk quarries in the area no plan is made to promote outdoor activities like sailing/ water sports or of increasing use of wildlife areas.</p> <p>This plan, as presented, should be allowed to go forward without further consultation on a more substantiated plan</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7833

<b>Person ID</b>	1265915
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Stephen Trueman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework . The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7955

<b>Person ID</b>	1266002
<b>Full Name</b>	ROXANNE RANSLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	No evidence to support unreasonable growth around Tring and Berkhamsted. Green belt development against gov guidelines, no evidence of current situation consideration.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7956
<b>Person ID</b>	1266002
<b>Full Name</b>	ROXANNE RANSLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	All sites around Tring are unsuitable for the development identified. The transport plans are uncertain and do not promote sustainable travel. Green belt land will be destroyed and there is insufficient infrastructure within Tring to open with 60% more housing. Dacorum residents deserve the right homes in the right place.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7957
<b>Person ID</b>	1266002
<b>Full Name</b>	ROXANNE RANSLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Impact of development on the Beechwoods SAC has not been assessed, traffic issues within a town not designed for cars not fully explored. No mitigation for impact on greenbelt loss shown.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7977
<b>Person ID</b>	1265094
<b>Full Name</b>	Rebecca Gurnham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We have spent the last few months studying Dacorum's housing plans for Berkhamsted and Tring; we are shocked and saddened to see the overwhelming extent of the plans, a 55% increase of housing in one single step for Tring, carving up vital Green Belt, beautiful biodiverse countryside and precious farmland. As well as the increased pollution and traffic, we are extremely worried about the environmental impact, including the tragic loss of habitat and the continued irreversible damage to our precious rare chalk streams, severely endangered by this unprecedented housing plan.

Tring is the friendliest of towns we've ever known, welcoming all who travel through, or choose to settle here to make it their forever home. Within commuting distance of London Euston, it has grown organically and comfortably, expanding gradually to accommodate those, like us, seeking open skies, bucolic charm and outstanding natural beauty: the chosen idyll for our children, learning to appreciate and trust in Nature, secure and safe in a small market town.

Looking at Tring specifically, the proposed plans would dramatically increase the size of our town, putting a dangerous strain on local services and commuter transport. We've always been of the mindset that all are welcome and would want other families to enjoy the treasured beauty of Tring's countryside, but the areas charted for development are precious swathes of countryside and farmland: sandwiched between the canal and final rows of residential dwellings. Between the harvesting and sowing, deer can be spotted, red kites soar and the owl's gentle call heard on a still night. During lockdown, Marshcroft Lane and the paths beyond have been a vital route for the daily exercise of Tring residents, fresh air and space in easy reach.

We understand the need for more affordable housing. We understand the need for more public services and stronger infrastructure. We understand that land is precious. But to destroy the lungs of a town to extend its arms does not make sense at all. To welcome new families to a town robbed of its natural beauty, is not how a healthy town grows. Instead, we plead with you to use your voice to represent the heart and soul of your community, to challenge these unsustainable housing plans. Invest in our local services and find alternative ways to build affordable housing, without stripping the land of its highly valued Green Belt and rich biodiversity.

Today, our young children can toddle freely along Marshcroft Lane, spotting wildlife across Grove Fields. We hope that you can help us to ensure that the children of the future can continue to enjoy the beauty of this treasured land.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8096

**Person ID** 1266055

**Full Name** Sheila Bingham

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I understand that more housing is needed however:

- 1 The number suggested is excessive for the already crowded South East and more should be built elsewhere especially as commuting to London may no longer be as significant post covid.
- 2 The houses will be built on green belt land, which in view of climate change should not be allowed. In particular land near the ANOB should be protected.
- 3 The number of houses suggested for Tring is far too large. Tring is an attractive small town with a narrow high street and limited parking.

It will not be able to cope with an almost doubling of its population and probably an additional 2-3000 cars. Bulbourne Road, and Cow Road are not suitable entry points for a large number of extra cars. Building a cycle path does not mean that people will give up their cars.

- 1 I note that additional schools are suggested - are these being built at the same time or before the houses. If not there will be a severe problem with a potentially large number of additional school children.
- 2 I note there is no mention of an increase in GP surgeries.
- 3 It is unlikely there will be sufficient employment created locally, which means people will be commuting and Tring station is not well placed so people will be using their cars.

I would like to register an objection to the number of houses being planned

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS8130

**Person ID**

1145701

**Full Name**

Mrs Thelma Gillen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my concern about the level of new housing proposed for Tring in the Dacorum Strategic Plan. My concerns are:

- 1 The current plans for Dacorum would increase Tring's population by 50%. As you know, Tring is a small market town and the level of proposed building, almost all on green belt, will destroy the very precious character of the town. There are so few such small market towns left in Dacorum, I believe they are worth preserving. The plans

simply include any site that might be available for building rather than any sensible attempt at improving the lives and well-being of residents or concern about the impact on the environment and wildlife.

- 2 Tring is in the 'Tring Promontory' - part of Hertfordshire that juts into Buckinghamshire. The A41 trunk road means that many Tring residents work and shop in Aylesbury and Aston Clinton, where the level of house building is very extensive. It seems logical, therefore, that basic geography, as well as artificial county boundaries, should form part of the planning criteria, so that the increase in Aylesbury/Aston Clinton housing is taken into account when considering any new allocation in the Tring area.

I understand the need for new housing but believe it should be more reasonably allocated to take into account the preservation of green belt with the consequent benefits to the wildlife that relies on it, and the mental wellbeing of residents and visitors.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8154

**Person ID** 1266096

**Full Name** ALICE EARNSHAW

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my objection to the Dacorum local plan, particularly relating to the disproportionate number of houses proposed in Tring without clear planning or capacity for sufficient infrastructure along with destruction of green belt land. I am not opposed to the growth of the town and hope that a more appropriate increase in population would benefit local businesses, but feel the number of houses being proposed is disproportionate and not sensible for Tring's small and basis amenities, including the very narrow high street that is already potentially dangerous when walking with young children and would be even worse with a 55% increase in cars and buses.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8168



<b>Person ID</b>	1266113
<b>Full Name</b>	Michaela Foster-Osborne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8201
<b>Person ID</b>	1266150
<b>Full Name</b>	Michela Capozzi
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	1 Developments in Northchurch, Berkhamsted and Tring

Whilst I am a resident of Northchurch I also feel very strongly against the proposals for the developments in Berkhamsted and Tring. Not only will the developments proposed in Berkhamsted and Tring be detrimental to the residents of the towns but also to the residents of Northchurch. Located between the two towns, Northchurch will, undoubtedly, be impacted by additional traffic along the A4251 as people travel between the two and don't use the by-pass as getting on and off it will take them additional time.

Also, neither Tring nor Berkhamsted have the infrastructure to cope with the additional population demand these developments would bring. It is claimed that Berkhamsted town centre would serve the new developments and cites the new car park as aiding the additional traffic into the town. The new car park was built to alleviate the terrible parking issues the town has and has not been built to future-proof for additional development. Additionally, despite claims to ensure accessibility to the train stations and shops etc all developments in both Tring and Berkhamsted will result in more traffic on the already congested roads as the distance from amenities will mean walking will not be an option and any bus service will never support the flexibility people will expect.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8254

**Person ID** 1266158

**Full Name** Mr and Mrs Karl and Mikaela Morgan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum. This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8264
<b>Person ID</b>	1266159
<b>Full Name</b>	Carol Hart
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Here is my response to Dacorum's Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>Tring has a friendly feel to it, surrounded by easily accessible countryside for locals and visitors to enjoy. Building on Green Belt land will damage our beautiful countryside, destroying areas important not only for humans, but where wildlife, birds and insects can thrive. Green Belt land was designed around towns to <i>prevent</i> urban sprawl. Tring is facing a 55% increase in new houses!</p> <p>Such a huge number of new houses, in addition to those already being built next to Tring Cemetery, will cause traffic congestion and pollution at a time when we should all be thinking more about our environment.</p> <p>The government is not taking into account and does not care how this scale of housing will affect those already living in Tring. I hope that Dacorum Borough Council does. There are not sufficient jobs for such a housing development, again more pollution and traffic as people commute out of town. It will put a huge strain on local facilities. As we have seen in many areas of the country, these developments do not mean affordable housing for locals unable to get a foot on the ladder. It means large expensive houses for people who can easily buy such housing already in existence.</p> <p>In certain areas of the north east of England, high quality houses have been knocked down because high unemployment has caused people to move away, creating ghost towns. This will be the same in other areas where once there was high employment. Why is the government not investing in employment in these areas which already have the housing and need their communities back? These are the questions I would like our local council to ask this government, rather than accepting the housing quota for Dacorum.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8298

<b>Person ID</b>	1266172
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr and Mrs P.C Pegrum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We have lived in Tring for 40 years and have seen a lot of residential building projects taking place during this time and understand that all towns must support growth and development in an appropriate way. We cannot see how increasing a small market town like Tring by 55% (2,731 houses are planned) is a balanced proposal.</p> <p>We only received the brochure for us to review a couple of weeks ago and this is not sufficient time for anyone to really research and reply to this proposal, but we felt that we must say something. Some of our neighbours did not receive a copy of the brochure and so we are concerned that this omission may have occurred elsewhere denying a full and satisfactory number of comments being received to judge what is right for the residents in the surrounding villages/towns.</p> <p>Also because of the Covid-19 situation, we have been unable to attempt to meet with other concerned local people and have a consultation with yourselves face to face as indeed we have done in the past (Tring relocation of local dump site and also when there were concerns about increase in flights from/to Luton London Airport) and to register our concerns/opinions. We have not been able to meet with residents in the High Street and distribute leaflets about the proposal to ensure that most residents are aware of what is happening.</p> <p>These are just a couple of concerns that my family has.</p> <p>However of most concern is the planned erosion of the Green Belt in the Borough and AONB. Surely the Council should be seeking other more suitable areas to build upon before developing homes on Green Belt - the definition of which I state from the Government's document Paragraph 133 which says "the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land PERMANENTLY OPEN; the essential characteristics of GREEN BELTS are their openness and their PERMANENCE". Clearly that means that the DBC are working in complete contradiction to the Government's National Planning Policy Framework specifically in the protection and unnecessary development of GREEN BELT land. Surely this is something that the Council Members must need to address before someone decides to pursue this within a legal framework as environmental groups have done with regards to HS2 and how much money would be wasted with court appeals and legal costs yet achieving nothing for everyone concerned.</p>

Surely it would be worthwhile for a postponement of any planning considerations at the moment (Covid-19 lockdown restrictions) until the parties concerned (various local concerned groups, etc.) can meet and liaise with the DBC planning council and hold a meeting that can be positive for all parties involved.

My family have read the recent Response by the Chiltern Countryside Group and fully support the broader points made by them.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8314

**Person ID** 1266175

**Full Name** Anna Foster

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am also greatly concerned about the huge proposals in other parts of Berkhamsted, and Tring – it will totally ruin both of the market towns, and the traffic on the route between the two will be untenable. I regularly walk my children to Northchurch recreation ground which involves crossing the main road, which is already quite terrifying, let alone with so much more traffic added.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8329

**Person ID** 1266176

**Full Name** Francesca Ryde

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to you regarding the Proposed Development in Long Marston for over 3,000 houses.</p> <p>Have you thought about the local infrastructure? The small country lanes already smothered in pot-holes, large vehicles ruining verges, encroaching on the ditches (to MINIMISE FLOODING), destroying wildlife? What about the farms already there, for hundreds of years, actually sitting on FLOOD PLAINS? What about the schools, the doctors surgery's, the already at capacity local hospitals and tiny train stations barely able to meet current capacity? The list could go on, but I am aware we are VERY SHORT OF TIME.</p> <p>Quite frankly this is ridiculous and has not been diligently thought through. As for the timeframe of LESS THAN A WEEK for objections to be raised and informing the landowners; it is an utter disgrace. You may have pressures from higher powers but seriously, have you not thought beyond that? You clearly have no heart for the people you are supposed to look over. Livelihoods will be lost, generations of farming destroyed, wildlife killed, local workforce's crippled, current locals needs disregarded, all for you to 'meet targets'. Good luck when the rain comes is all I can add. We live on clay!</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider your planning and your ultimatum timeframe. Have a heart.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8334
<b>Person ID</b>	1266194
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael Bromberg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As a local citizen, (ADDRESS REDACTED), I appreciate the need for continued growth of housing in Dacorum but object to the above plans on the following grounds:

1 The numbers involved seem greater than government requirement. Increasing the size of Berkhamsted and Northchurch by 24% and Tring 51% would completely change the character of these historic market towns. The impact of the pandemic will need evaluation with possible change of use of retail as business properties to residential. There is also the impact of Brexit to consider with fewer people from the EU choosing to make Britain their home.

2 The Green Belt is vital and should be preserved. Covid19 has shown how important it is for both exercise and mental health. There would be a huge impact on the environment particularly alongside the canal in Northchurch.

3 The impact on the water supply would be detrimental in this area of chalk streams.

4 The infrastructure can barely cope now let alone with such a massive increase in population. More doctors, dentists, schools etc would be necessary and the transport system hugely increased.

5 The long narrow shape of Berkhamsted within the valley would be compromised .

I hope this plan will be critically reviewed.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8390

**Person ID** 1266216

**Full Name** Debby Coles

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.

Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.

This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8447
<b>Person ID</b>	1266276
<b>Full Name</b>	BARBARA ANSCOMBE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p>



To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8492

**Person ID** 1266311

**Full Name** Dr Gwynneth Down

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Within the overall housing plans within Dacorum, the proposed number of houses suggested for Tring are highly disproportionate representing a 55% increase in housing (2700 houses).  
 This assessment of housing need then places a significant risk to the heritage of the area, protected landscapes and Green Belt.  
 Any new development on sites to the east of Tring intrinsically would fail to take account of sensitive views, landscape and protected environmental sites. The governments own advice says that 'meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places'. No evidence to justify unquestionable damage to Green Belt and AONB is given.  
 The requirement for two primary schools and a secondary school is a by-product of the substantial housing growth proposed to be allocated within the Local Plan that I strongly object to. Such wide scale growth in Tring has not been sufficiently justified and as such the by product of the schools are unlikely to be necessary.  
 The delivery of open space and sports and leisure facilities is a good aim. However the Local plan suggests however taking away widespread open countryside and land which contributes to the AONB. This would be a very significant loss which would defeat the object of seeking to secure new space and leisure facilities for the health and wellbeing of local

people. The document appears to confuse and conflate the provision of playing fields or linked green areas to wildlife corridors and attempts to reduce biodiversity loss.

The Local Plan has an overarching aim of ensuring developments protect and enhance the distinctiveness and historical importance of towns and villages. This seems completely at odds with the proposed plans for Tring in particular, where bolted on developments are likely to significantly detract from the distinctiveness of a small historic market town surrounded by AONB, Green Belt and SSSI's. It is likely to detract significantly from the enjoyment, health and well being of current and future residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8496

**Person ID** 1266311

**Full Name** Dr Gwynneth Down

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing growth to Tring (55%) in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum within the plan period.

The Draft plan has failed to show the exceptional evidence required to justify the use of Green Belt land for housing in Tring (i.e proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03). Significant and irreversible harm would be caused to the openness of Green Belt and AONB and to the biodiversity within it. The Council has not shown that this harm is balanced by collective benefits and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft polices SP23 and Sp24 on this basis.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum is for developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and to protect and enhance the historical environment. There is little evidence that this strategy has been applied to proposed developments in Tring.

NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces – there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around Tring. This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key ‘honey pots’ of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.

Throughout the Plan there is confusion between what constitutes green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors and lack of explicit requirements around wildlife corridors, hedgerows and buffer zones (DBC Urban Nature Study maps; Tring. Herts Biological

Records Centre 2005/6).

The Plan should be explicit in requiring developers to use the highest standards for renewable energy, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity.

I strongly disagree with the idea that the existing people of Tring will gain incrementally greater benefit from larger and larger developments. There is no justification or supporting evidence for this within the Plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8497

**Person ID** 1266311

**Full Name** Dr Gwynneth Down

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

*Environment and Biodiversity.*

We are in a climate emergency and this should be the highest context for any developments or growth plan.

The plan however gives little detail about the potential impact of developments on biodiversity and overall environment. It also does not commit to any detailed strategies for enhancing and protecting biodiversity and historic environments. The plan would create irreversible harm to Green Belt land and AONB within Tring with the cumulative effect of all of the building, population increase, roads and traffic alongside the land loss compounding this threat. Community human health is also at risk with the loss of green spaces, increased pollution and taking away from attractive and historic environment.

Opportunities for nature conservation should be found, ahead of any development.

Government policy gives a responsibility to councils to show why there are exceptional circumstances for using Green Belt land for developments. As above, I do not believe the council has shown evidence for the huge increase in homes in Dacorum overall, and particularly the disproportionate number of these in Tring.

Whatever evidence might show of housing need, the council hasn't shown evidence that brownfield land and/or land that is not within the Green Belt in Tring has been assessed to meet any housing requirement. It also hasn't shown the Duty to Cooperate of consulting with other adjacent Local Planning Authorities in relation to this local plan. Irrespective of the housing requirement it hasn't therefore identified exceptional circumstances to justify the use of Green Belt land.

Tring is bounded on two sides by Buckinghamshire. Their plans will impact hugely on employment, traffic, local land use within and across boundaries. The council have said they will need to demonstrate they have satisfied the Duty to Cooperate *by the time* the Local Plan is submitted for examination. This shows that the council is not using the Duty to Cooperate to *inform* their planning strategy along with cross boundary councils, rather seeing it as a tick list exercise after the event.

The plans for building in Tring are not compatible with protecting and enhancing the distinctive landscape, open land, biological and geological diversity in Tring. They would destroy the natural landscape in different parts of the town, including Green Belt and land surrounded by the Chilterns AONB.

The areas of Tr01, Tr02, Tr03 p are of important value for for wildlife and biodiversity as well as important sites for human recreation and wellbeing. Particularly in the current Climate Emergency, and global threats to biodiversity these important areas should be preserved for current and future generations. The plans appear to confuse and conflate new sports and leisure open spaces with open countryside and wildlife corridors. The loss of the latter cannot be mitigated against with the former. Wherever possible wildlife corridors, ancient hedgerows and trees should be preserved and enhanced.

Building a major road junction on Cow Lane and two new major road junctions on the London Road in Tring will cause serious environmental harm to wildlife and humans through pollution, noise, and congestion. Potentially building a road across an important wildlife corridor (Marshcroft Lane) will undoubtedly cause destruction of wildlife habitats and biodiversity.

The plan mentions the risk to Ashridge estate SSSI and Stubbings Wood of increased population and visitor numbers but gives inadequate assessment of these. I believe that the impact of local traffic increase, pollution and visitor numbers would have a very negative impact on these sites and that of Tring Park SSSI. The impact of these should be considered alongside housing need. Government policy seems clear that councils have responsibilities for assessing housing need alongside local environmental concerns rather than the former trumping the latter.

I concur with the need for a network of cycle paths and would have liked to see more detail of proposals for these. They need to be well connected and integrated into any new development. Lighting should be at a low level to minimise effects on birds, insects and mammals.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8498

**Person ID** 1266311

**Full Name** Dr Gwynneth Down

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

*Infrastructure*

The vision within the Local Plan of thousands of new homes being added to perimeters of Tring (and Berkhamsted) and using Green Belt land is not backed up with adequate assessment of the pressures on water supplies, traffic, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements). There is little sustainable about the construction nor preserving of our heritage about this plan.

Tring is bounded on two sides by Buckinghamshire. Their plans will impact hugely on employment, traffic, local land use etc. It's very important as the cross boundary impacts of changes in infrastructure are immense. Plans could certainly change in response, for example there is lots of warehousing very local along the A41 and its very unclear that more is needed within Tring itself.

The wish to look at increasing bus routes and numbers may be one way to ease some of large increase in traffic that this plan would create but a clear commitment is needed for this. Sustainable modern transport connections are mentioned

but concrete requirements not given. Public transport must be greatly improved both to connect new homes to their town centres but also to reduce traffic congestion on the roads which cannot be widened.

Well connected and maintained dedicated cycle routes throughout our towns must be implemented along with secure bike storage. Recreational corridors should be incorporated within new built-up areas to promote cycling and pedestrian access through the development and provide connectivity with the existing town and the countryside boundaries. These routes should not be limited to narrow, dark alleyways but should be several metres wide with natural vegetation to make travelling pleasantly airy and to support bio-diversity.

The plan suggests that 3 new schools are needed within Tring because of the increase in housing. However the plan also seems to suggest the reverse has taken place - that a secondary school within Tring is desired and therefore it should be paid for/justified by building lots of houses! The idea for two further primary schools and as secondary is based on the premise of the large number of houses and isn't likely to be necessary, unless far more evidence is given for this requirement.

New roads in the area will hugely increase congestion, pollution and impact on biodiversity. They would adversely affect the wellbeing and quality of life of both human and wildlife populations.

Building a new supermarket near to the existing Tescos in Tring will not offer local people what they need and will add to the congestion and pollution in the area. The development of the existing markets within Tring offer employment opportunities to locals, and a more sustainable model for local food and produce.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8499

**Person ID** 1266311

**Full Name** Dr Gwynneth Down

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

*Character of Tring/Local distinctiveness*

An overarching strategy for development in Dacorum is that developments are distinctive to the local settlement. This aim is not carried through into the actual plans, in particular for Tring which is earmarked for massive expansion and loss of important green spaces.

Tring is often described as a 'town that thinks it's a village'. It is a historic market town sited in the middle of important AONB's, SSSI's and Green Belt land. The plans for building in Tring are not compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character of the town. They would destroy the natural landscape in different parts of the town, including Green Belt and land surrounded by the Chilterns AONB.

The areas of Tr01, Tr02, Tr03 p are of important value for human recreation and wellbeing as well as important sites for wildlife and biodiversity. Particularly in the current Climate Emergency, and global threats to wildlife these important areas should be preserved for current and future generations.

Building a major road junction on Cow Lane and two new major road junctions on the London Road in Tring will cause serious environmental harm to wildlife and humans through pollution, noise, and congestion. Potentially building a road across an important wildlife corridor (Marshcroft Lane) will undoubtedly cause destruction of wildlife habitats and biodiversity.

I do not believe that a second supermarket close to the current Tescos would be of any benefit to residents of Tring and would add to congestion and pollution across Tring and villages around it. I agree with Tring in Transition that this would be better sited nearer to Bulbourne to provide better access for residents in that part of Tring.

Similarly, Tring is a rural market town and not a suitable place for an industrial area, as planned for TR01. As above, warehousing and industrial sites are to be found very locally on the A41 and this should be part of the Duty to Cooperate discussions with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire.

The idea that existing residents and visitors to Tring would gain greater benefit from larger and larger developments are not justified in the plan or any supporting evidence. I strongly disagree with this proposition.

The plan could and should recognise what makes Tring distinctive. The plan should be as proactive in improving our surroundings as it is in adding new houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8505

**Person ID** 1266311

**Full Name** Dr Gwynneth Down

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>It is considered that a reversion back to a strategy whereupon Hemel Hempstead take on the vast majority of housing need subsequently calculated through an objectively assessed needs assessment would provide a more appropriate provision of development for the borough, taking into consideration the socioeconomic and physical infrastructure associated with Hemel Hempstead; the greater opportunity for substantially increased density provision of brownfield land and the reduced cumulative impacts upon the Green Belt and the reduced environmental impacts upon tightly constrained settlements located elsewhere throughout the borough.</i></p> <p><i>If on completion of a satisfactory process of determining an objectively assessed need that it can be demonstrated against the expectations of Paragraph 137 of the Framework there is a requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, such a requirement should take into consideration the varying characteristics of the landscape surrounding the settlement and particularly its contribution towards the functionality of the Green Belt and its relationship with the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8506
<b>Person ID</b>	1266311
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Gwynneth Down
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>The need for 'disAncAve' development is menAoned several Ames in connecAon both with the natural and built environments (e.g., 'All seClements will have retained their separate and disAncAve idenAAes informed by proposals that were shaped by a detailed understanding of place.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Overarching Vision, page 22).</i></li> </ul>



*It is not clear how this will be either defined or agreed for Tring, which is arguably the most distinctive settlement in Dacorum in terms of natural setting, social and economic history. Neither is it clear how this will be given 'teeth' in order to proactively shape development.*

*In the absence of a working definition, Tring in Transition has created an initial description of what makes Tring distinctive to help shape what we would expect to see in the final version of the Plan. This highlights our unique heritage and location, including:*

- A Rothschild legacy of forward-thinking development, respect for the environment, bold and challenging designs and solutions.*
- A strong heritage of local renewable energy with significant wind and*
- A location surrounded by more than 50% of Dacorum's SSSIs, extensive AONBs, as well as extensive hedgerows and other wild places.*
- A service-oriented, agricultural, market legacy and a traditional destination location to visit, meet, relax and socialise.*

*To address the need for growth, enhance the existing town centre and correct assumptions apparently carried over from previous planning exercises (traceable back to the 1990s).*

*We proposed taking a lead from existing '21st-century market town' schemes successfully being deployed in Yorkshire, Stroud etc. In summary, this includes recognising the limited need for new town centre retail space; acknowledging that central supermarkets are more damaging environmentally than those designed to limit travel and traffic congestion; and acknowledging changing employment patterns and social norms (this is especially true for Tring).*

- Replace proposals for significant new retail space and encourage more food, experiential, social, entertainment and 'destination' spaces etc.*
- Revisit plans for a central supermarket (which will only add to issues with existing traffic hot spots) and recognise the patterns of use from those living in villages to the north of Tring. (Depending on revisions to developments – this could well be at the Bulbourne side of town.)*
- Remove proposals for warehousing and large industrial units on the Dunsley Farm site and build on Tring's heritage as a service-oriented market town by building smaller, more flexible workspaces that reflect rapidly growing local/home-working*
- Revisit plans for Tr06/Brook St: prioritise schemes fronting to the High Street, encouraging food, social and 'destination' spaces.*
- Recognise that Dunsley Farm is better suited to residential home development than light industry – meeting both social and employment needs.*

*To address pressures on local green spaces, SSSIs, biodiversity and Green Belt loss.*

*The definitions of open spaces, green spaces, green buffers and wildlife corridors need to be more explicit. They are a consistent cause of confusion and question in the Plan. There is a need for all of these, but given the high number of SSSIs around Tring, AONBs, the Beechwood SAC, etc. **there is an opportunity to establish a country-leading if not world-leading scheme where defined wildlife corridors are proactively established around the entire perimeter of the town, through new developments and onwards to local nature reserves etc.***

- *Implement joined-up wildlife corridors through and around all new*
- *Explicitly plan to proactively link all SSSIs via wildlife/green*
- *Provide managed public access through a new network of*
- *Provide an opportunity for the various organisations managing local wild spaces (Woodland Trust, National Trust, Wildlife Trusts, Chiltern Society, Rothschild Estates etc.) to work together with the Council to design and build this. (An initial poll of these organisations indicates a strong willingness.)*
- *Recognise NPPF requirement that any Green Belt development requires explicit mitigation*

*and improvement on other Green Belt land. (The inclusion of green and open spaces in existing Green Belt parcels earmarked for development does not count towards this.)*

*To address county and national carbon targets and to reinvent Tring’s legacy of renewable energy use. We acknowledge statements about going beyond current government guidelines on new housing insulation. This sounds good but will already be superseded by more demanding targets before we are halfway through the term of this Plan. We are also aware that developers have pushed back with statements like ‘we don’t find a market for solar panels’ etc. These are, frankly, irrelevant and should be entirely disregarded.*

*Developments around Tring have a clear and new opportunity to embrace the highest possible standards that can be mandated (if not higher):*

- *All new developments built to highest possible standards of carbon neutral build and energy efficient*
- *Renewable energy targets, inclusion of solar systems in new homes (regardless of any developer pushback) should be explicitly mandated.*
- *See our detailed response to SP24*

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8511

**Person ID** 1265044

**Full Name** Joseph Price

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Section 4.2 (page 28) of the plan mentions "– contributing to protecting and enhancing the natural, historic and built environment, and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change."</p> <p>I completely agree with this statement and its intent.</p> <p>Which is why I am so utterly furious at the proposed developments (specifically Tr03) in Tring, which destroys a massive area of Green Belt land - which we will never get back. I have not seen any evidence of how Tring's biodiversity is being protected, enhanced, or improved. Nor do I see how building on Green Belt land is helping us to adapt to climate change.</p> <p>In the years since the 2017, when this local plan was first conceived, much has changed re: sustainability and climate change. I have personally made huge changes to the way I live my life, and how I plan my future, in light of the climate crisis. This will only accelerate, and become more widely accepted as time goes on. To me, these plans are already a disgrace from an environmental point of view. In years to come, I will certainly not be alone in thinking that. On the contrary, I honestly believe that proponents of this environmentally destructive plan will be perceived as tone deaf.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8512
<b>Person ID</b>	1265044
<b>Full Name</b>	Joseph Price
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I totally disagree with the assertion in 23.151 that the station is 'not well located in relation to the town centre, being some 2km away'. If you asked people who live in Tring, I'm sure you would find that having a historic market town with a well connected train station just outside of town is the best of both worlds.</p> <p>Also in 23.151 it is stated that 'whilst there is a shared footway and cycle path along Station Road there is a need to upgrade the route to encourage its use'. Again, I can assure you that the path to the station is extremely well used by walkers, cyclists, joggers and is often very busy. I would agree that it could do with some attention (it was nice that it was resurfaced last year) but I don't think that improving this cycle/foot path, which is already very well used, is an excuse to irrevocably destroy a disgraceful amount of beautiful Green Belt land, which is still used for agriculture. This is madness.</p>

As a resident of Aldbury and Tring Station (2 small villages in a rural setting), I am certain that the nature of the proposed developments for the East of Tring will also destroy the current nature of where me and my neighbours live. We do not live in an urban area, we live in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Destroying fields to bleed Tring into a big town, closer to the station, will completely change the quiet, peaceful nature of Tring Station and Aldbury.

Under 23.158, parking provision at Tring Station is also mentioned. Whilst many people, myself included, will be returning to some form of commuting in the coming months, many people, myself included, will be doing so at a much reduced frequency. The car park at Tring Station should be more than sufficient for future commuting levels, and should not be expanded even if it is not sufficient. There is a climate emergency, as declared by Dacorum Council, and we must absolutely not incentivise the use of personal vehicles in this way for commuting. Walking, cycling, and public transport, MUST be harnessed.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8519

**Person ID** 1265044

**Full Name** Joseph Price

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

This local plan proposes irrevocable destruction of precious Green Belt land, and the small, rural, historic market town of Tring. As such, I find the proposals for Tring, specifically Tr03, very upsetting. This local plan first started in 2017, 4 years ago. I put it to you that a lot has changed since then, and that in the next 4 years - the concept of building on Green Belt land, that we will never, ever get back, will be so totally unacceptable to the vast majority of people that the Council would not attempt to.

I put it to you that protecting our environment, our Green Belt, the natural world, is our primary concern. Mitigating and adapting to climate change, one of the objectives of the local plan, is absolutely one of our highest priorities, as is conserving and protecting the natural environment (another objective of the local plan). Whichever way you try to slice it, the proposals for Tring at Tr03 are entirely against these objectives and frankly make a mockery of the efforts of the Council and residents, like myself, who make considerable efforts (in good faith) to do our part to fight climate change. On that basis I am totally against these proposals.

I appreciate that the Conservative Government has given you the target, and to an extent you are 'just doing your jobs' or 'just following orders'. I hope that someone in a position of power will have enough of a backbone to stand up for what's right, and acknowledge that Tr03 is simply unacceptable from an environmental point of view. Anyone who is willing to do so, will surely be heralded as a hero in the fight against climate change, and for the generations of Tring residents, past, present, and future, for protecting the soul of our town.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8561

**Person ID** 1266562

**Full Name** AMY CLAYTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

I oppose the development in the Tring area for a number of reasons, including the following:

- Too great an impact on precious greenbelt land, including local farming land and areas of outstanding natural beauty in the Tring area, when I believe alternatives have not been fully explored, for example using brownfield land.
- Too many houses planned to be build in Tring, where resources such as healthcare and schools are already stretched.
- Many of the houses being built are actually not affordable housing and are out of reach for most local people / families. This is very wrong, in my opinion. You only have to look at the price range of the Cala Homes development at the new Roman Park on Icknield Way to see that these are out of reach for the majority of hard-working families. In addition, these houses are being built ridiculously close together, with tiny gardens barely any green spaces surrounding them - this surely is not good for the environment, is not in keeping with the rest of the town and risks overwhelming local facilities.
- I understand that the figures behind this plan are based on 2014 ONS housing estimates as the baseline, rather than the more recent 2018 estimates, particularly in relation to Tring. This seems wrong and needs to be urgently reviewed,

with open communication and transparency provided to local residents and all those affected, regarding justification for decisions.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8597

**Person ID** 1264320

**Full Name** JACKIE GLOSSOP

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to make a few comments with regards to the proposals relating to the future of Tring in the coming years. I will try to make them brief and to the point as having read many of the responses it appears to show a lack of flexibility by Dacorum in promoting an end date for this consultation. Something that is not appropriate or justified at this very unusual time. I have read the proposals which are causing major concerns for the Tring communities. Change is inevitable, we are, as individuals, the cause of some changes but these proposals signify a change that is rather more than local business and housing plans, and your conditions for not allowing a proposal that could impact to the detriment of a town, clearly stated in your document, have been completely ignored by yourselves.

What you are proposing and will approve because that seems to be pre-ordained, will change the very core of Tring. The current infrastructures will not be sufficient to cope with the number of people expected to move here. Who has said the Primary Care Services have capacity for such a large number of new people? Was It Herts Valleys Clinical Commissioning Group? They do have a lot of information on local services but not always based on the right statistics, eg a good way for GPs to see more patients is to reduce the number of services they offer. You can only go so far down that route before you change the wonderful service offered by Rothschild House Group to the mediocre and that would be a really dreadful way to achieve a hoped for result.

What plans are there to support development? How can you consider removing two working farms? Local farms offer a service to the local communities which is unique and also allows young children to have an idea of how important they

are. You are looking at a significant number of vehicles, in the hundreds, leaving the estate to get on the local roads, none of which are really appropriate for such an increase. I state this from the point of looking at the rural nature of the surrounding land. As you drive from Berkhamsted along the bypass the road undulates and it is a really beautiful setting, with fields rising up towards Wigginton. Driving on the way back to Berkhamsted you have the view going along the valleys with the village of Aldbury nestling sheltered in the valley. All current dwellings fit in well with the local landscape. You are recommending that all this beauty should go. Unfortunately our main roads need to be kept as clear as possible for commerce and the lanes which are often listed as cycle routes are totally inadequate. Cyclist also need to be accommodated. And what about the increase in pedestrian traffic - are they to be considered? Parking is an issue already, and with plans to remove some of the town's main car park for development, the increase in vehicles is going to become extremely hazardous.

You mention Covid-19 as if this was part of your considerations. If that is the case then you are way ahead of most in understanding how this current phenomenon will continue to affect our way of working and leisure. You should be thinking of slowing down this plan with its base firmly in yesterday's way of life and seeing what changes might be necessary for us all in the future.

With the number of new dwellings proposed in the area I would have thought that Herts CC should have looked at setting up a complete new town with the appropriate infrastructure. It would be an exciting opportunity to put in place a plan to suit future needs and allow the other areas to return to the general number of planning applications that are put forward every year. It would enable planners to consider what future requirements will be once a new normality returns. It is likely be a changed world and this should be a major part of future considerations and planning.

Sadly, we seem to have a new MP, Mr Gagan Mohindra who feels his time as a former District Councillor is more important than taking up his responsibilities as an MP - understandable but not good as this is a time for resolve and consideration of how his constituents consider these proposals. A time to think of the changes that the pandemic created over night, changes that would have taken an extremely long time without the overnight stop put on everything during the lockdown in March 2020. It seems he has become a resident of Tring which is remarkable as his constituency is a very strange shape and Tring is not really an ideal base for its MP being at its extreme edge. It will look as if he thinks these challenges are unrealistic as he is choosing to live here. I mention his former role because he has given that as his reason to support the plan.

I hope you will be able to consider how you go forward with a degree of common sense. The money spent on this consultation document is not entirely wasted as there are many interesting reports that would be an essential need. My view is you are spending a lot of money and it is a waste of time. Look at the history of the Kings Langley section of the M25. It was the final link of the M25 so it had to be built, but they had to have an enormously expensive Public Enquiry which failed to disprove what was clearly obvious. As a result the money spent on the Public Enquiry was not spent on

the road. This resulted in the cheapest viaduct being built and the ugliest. This now requires huge sums of money for repair to ensure safety.

For Tring I would ask you to think carefully before you turn a perfectly charming market town into a dormitory town and thus destroying its soul.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8660

**Person ID** 1248896

**Full Name** Ashleigh Genco

**Organisation Details** Harrow Estates plc

**Agent ID** 1258542

**Agent Full Name** Samantha  
Ryan

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Paragraph 23.138 of the Growth Strategy States:  
“The Settlement Hierarchy Study identifies Tring as one of the most sustainable towns in the Borough as it provides a hub for a range of services and facilities for its residents and surrounding rural hinterland. Given its size, level of facilities and transport links, the settlement should be an important focus for meeting the Borough’s development needs”  
Harrow agrees with this assessment and supports the Council’s positive approach in recognising the importance of Tring to meet the growth needs of Dacorum generally, and the communities in the north-west of the borough in particular. This is reflected in the Delivery Strategy for the town.  
The Plan sets out the general context of Tring including, inter alia:  

- the strong individual character of the town centre
- a range of employment opportunities in the town
- limited opportunities for new development to be accommodated within the existing urban area, given its historic core and lack of brownfield sites
- relative remoteness from Tring Station
- the range of sports and recreation facilities available to its residents; and



- landscape sensitivity, being surrounded by the Chilterns AONB

Harrow agrees that these are important factors to inform the Delivery Strategy for Tring which comprises the creation of new residential neighbourhoods on the edge of the town. It supports the proposals to deliver the majority of new development as a planned new neighbourhood to the east of Tring on land between Station Road and Bulbourne Road, creating physical and functional links from existing communities in the town to the railway station. The new neighbourhood can be delivered on land that adjoins, but lies outside the Chiltern's AONB. While it is not the most sensitive location for development, Harrow recognises that development will need to be sensitively designed and laid out to respect the setting of this important landscape designation, including in long distance views from the east. This will require the inclusion of significant green and blue infrastructure and an ecological buffer to the Canal.

Harrow also agrees that the new neighbourhood should come forward in a comprehensive, cohesive and co-ordinated manner to deliver the scale and range of new homes to meet the needs of existing and future residents, together with supporting community infrastructure and open space. Land east of Tring (comprising draft allocations Tr02 and Tr03) is of a scale that offers benefits for infrastructure co-ordination and delivery that would otherwise not be possible. The company, therefore, generally supports the Council's aim to bring forward a comprehensively planned urban extension and co-ordinated masterplans for the two sites ensuring delivery of homes and infrastructure in the right location and at the right time across the growth area. Both sites could be delivered in parallel to boost housing supply and meet a wide range of housing needs in the short term.

Accompanying this representation is a Vision Document containing an illustrative masterplan for a new garden suburb to meet the ambitions and objectives of the Delivery Strategy on land east of Tring (see also response to Q5). Harrow Estates plc look forward to working with the council and key stakeholders to develop that masterplan alongside the Local Plan as envisaged by draft policy SP24.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS8706

**Person ID**

1207333

**Full Name**

Growth Team

**Organisation Details**

Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Children's Services. Development proposed within Tring during the plan period amounts to an increase of 2,274 dwellings on five separate allocations, plus further developments arising from windfall and existing developments, which are, at this time, expected to be approximately 460 dwellings. This amounts to an additional child yield of 6fe when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield.

In order to accommodate the additional child yield from these sites, along with further developments arising from windfall and existing commitments, 2.92ha sites for two new primary schools amounting to 6fe are sought, to the east of the town. In addition to this, a 10.78ha site for a secondary school is also required, in order to meet the pupil yield arising from developments within the town and surrounding

Transport. It is considered that this section lacks a clear decisive explanation that growth will be mitigated by enabling and unlocking sustainable transport as a real way to travel within the town and to surrounding destinations. This approach, however, is clearly being taken and HCC will welcome the production and inclusion of Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Strategy, with the understanding that more work is

**Paragraph 23.145**

Children's Services. With regard to the new neighbourhood that is being planned at Dunsley Farm, the county council would not support a primary school located here, as it is considered that both primary schools would be best located within the growth areas that are located to the east of

**Paragraph 23.147**

Children's Services. The text within this paragraph that states: "...especially the need for two 2FE primary schools, a 6FE secondary school..." is incorrect (it should be two 3fe primary schools and an 8fe secondary school). Our detailed comments in relation to what we are asking for, regarding primary school provision in the Tring sites section should be referred

Transport. This paragraph mentions the delivery of a local north-south distributor road between Bulbourne Road and London Further clarification and justification of this is required before HCC could support this, as without a detailed understanding, the county council may object to this.

With regard to the bullet point within this paragraph that states: "provide and support new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and Tring Station" the county council would welcome specific policy around a station link for pedestrians and cyclists, this is a key opportunity for a fundamental improvement to the relationship and connectivity of the town and the station. This comment applies to all the discussion around this aspect of the

**Paragraph 23.155**

Transport. Congestion is known to be an issue for inter-urban bus services passing through the town. The wording and general theme when discussing transport needs to move away from solely describing car based trips, in line with HCC's adopted LTP4. Transport is not simply peak hour commuting for cars, movement of people is a cornerstone of placemaking and the approach and commentary within the plan should fully recognise

**Paragraph 23.158**

Transport. With regard to the proposed assessment of parking demand and mitigation measures, encouraging sustainable access to the station is an issue that needs addressing, not just from the perspective of new developments. The Strategic Transport and Rail Team within HCC work with the rail industry in line with the priorities set out in the Rail Strategy. The rail operator has developed a Station Travel Plan and there are also ideas within the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Plan to encourage use of sustainable modes to the station. Further work will be needed to determine priorities needing to be delivered from these documents.

**Included files****Title** Tring Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS8724**Person ID** 1266742**Full Name** LAWRENCE SIMPSON**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to register my strong objection to the current plan for house building in Tring over the next 18 years.

Secondly, The encroachment on greenbelt land is completely unacceptable for the purposes of housing. I am willing to accept green belt being lost for some developments such as solar farms, reservoirs and green gas facilities, but urban developments are not an option, particularly when you could find more brown sites with Decorum to build more residential properties.

Thirdly, I believe such a development should not be allowed to go ahead as it will fundamentally alter the character of the town. Tring exists as a small, peaceful countryside town and, by doubling its size, it will just become another large town and lose much of its unique character. I, like many of the residents of Tring, moved to live here for the quiet, peaceful town it is. It is unfair on existing residents to change the character of a town they have chosen to live in.

I send this objection with zero expectation that it will make any difference, and these horrible plans will go ahead regardless of these thoughts of local residents.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8728
<b>Person ID</b>	1264680
<b>Full Name</b>	Rebecca Desbois
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having tried to respond to the consultation online, I have given up as the process was extremely convoluted and seemingly designed to put people off from commenting.</p> <p>Whilst I am fully supportive of development within towns and cities, including Tring, I do feel that what is proposed for Tring (and other areas within Dacorum) is ludicrous. Increasing Tring by 55% seems very drastic. This will irreversibly change the fabric of the town from a historic market town to a sprawling 'new town' with limited character. Moreover, the current infrastructure isn't really fit for purpose and it doesn't look like huge improvements are going to be made.</p> <p>Loosing so much of our Green Belt in a time when environmental concerns are at the forefront of most people's thinking also seems like a very short sighted decision.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, I welcome development and would happily see areas of Tring enlarged or infilled, but I feel that the extent to which this is being planned is far too extreme. Little thought appears to have been given to the repercussions of such a huge population increase on services and infrastructure. I appreciate that quotas from government need to be met, but there is surely a better way to do this, other than destroying a beautiful town. As such I object wholeheartedly to the current local plan.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8748
<b>Person ID</b>	1264782
<b>Full Name</b>	Susannah Sawyer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My husband and I would like to add our names to the response given by The Grove Fields Residents Association. We wholeheartedly agree with what they have done and the report that has been submitted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8749
<b>Person ID</b>	1266758
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr James Sawyer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My husband and I would like to add our names to the response given by The Grove Fields Residents Association. We wholeheartedly agree with what they have done and the report that has been submitted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8753
<b>Person ID</b>	1265140
<b>Full Name</b>	Annabelle Woodward
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to express my concern over the emerging housing plans of Tring.</p> <p>I am a resident of Tring on Station Road and reviewing the plans of Tring over the forthcoming 17 years, the proportion of new builds to the ratio of the town size of Tring is overwhelmingly disproportionate. I am not against any new developments and the opportunities that brings to affordable housing and to local businesses, I am more concerned about the 'possible' amenities that 'may' happen to support such a vast increase of population - i.e. schools, doctors surgeries and parking at the train station. We are unable to support Tring's current needs of these amenities and to consider increasing the size of the town by what seems like almost 50% seems overwhelming and will change the face of the town irreversibly. If there was a concrete plan to build green spaces, schools and GP surgeries BEFORE any housing broke ground then this would seem a fair balance of supporting the new town.</p> <p>However, looking at the plans for the other Dacorum areas to be developed these seem more in proportion to the size of the town/village. I wish for the plans of Tring to be seriously reviewed and adjusted to be more in ratio to the current size of our town.</p> <p>Over the years that I have lived at this address we have had many concerns over the speed in which people drive up and down station road and how congested the junction can sometimes get when turning onto London road. I am surprised that there is not already some calming bumps on the road like on many roads that are used as thoroughfares throughout the town. I would like to understand more on how for the current residents of these areas, what the direct impact will be.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8760
<b>Person ID</b>	1266766
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Drew
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I object strongly to the huge overdevelopment of the small market town of Tring on several grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Overdevelopment - making the town of Tring 55% bigger and ruining the nature of a small, ancient market town.</li> <li>2 Building on large area of Green Belt land surrounding the town.</li> <li>3 Scant regard for building genuinely affordable homes.</li> <li>4 Holding consultation on so large a plan during lockdown denies the opportunity for community appraisals and meetings regarding the future development. This consultation period should be extended until proper community meetings can be held and plans and detailed models viewed. The maps sent out in the consultation pamphlet are deliberately lacking in detail and simplified almost beyond recognition. Each area's development isolated from the other so that the grand scale of over-development is hidden. This is undemocratic. You have been elected to represent us, not to disenfranchise us.</li> <li>5 Scant regard has been paid to provision of schools, health services, traffic considerations and other local infrastructure. House sales in the area are often unable to go ahead due to lack of available school places. These issues should be addressed and be in place before any permission is given for additional housing.</li> <li>6 Development of the Auction, market place, car parking, Fire Station and museum for another supermarket would have deeply detrimental effects on the town's amenities as well causing the already-congested Brook Street to come to a standstill.</li> <li>7 There are many other issues to be addressed including environmental concerns. More OPEN consultation and time is needed.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8814
<b>Person ID</b>	1266790
<b>Full Name</b>	Jeremy Greaves
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	Yes

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Tring, I feel utterly disappointed that my local council are considering this expansion. Tring is a lovely town. I moved here for the aesthetics, the school, the green space and thoroughly enjoy the tring triangle areas. What a great place to live.</p> <p>If this expansion goes ahead, you are dumping over 6000 more cars into the area. You will be destroying are beautiful open spaces. Our views will be ruined and the areas which have given great relief to the residents during a year long lock down will disappear.</p> <p>I moved to tring for its continued interest and ability to keep the town green. To combat our environmental footprint and now the council are considering only money and cash flow, how depressing. By accepting this expansion you are considering only money and growth of the worst kind.</p> <p>Think of the people. The plan is absolutely abhorrent and utterly selfish for the minority who gain financially. Let's not ruin Tring. Let Tring recover from Covid and grow with further green areas and local independent shops. Let's not destroy car park areas and let's not bring stress and strain to our local doctors and schools, who have been absolute heroes and continue to be.</p> <p>I ask you to consider the residents and not be blinded by self gain.</p> <p>Tring is a beautiful town. Your expansion will bring nothing to the people who live in it except shaded gardens and blocked views. Further pollution and a strain on our resources. Please do not green light this expansion.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8821
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	



<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring</p> <p>Here are our initial thoughts on the Delivery Strategy -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of a significant area of open countryside – can this be justified?</li> <li>• Are there exceptional circumstances to remove the sites from the Green Belt?</li> <li>• The openness of the Green Belt is a critical feature of the 3 main sites.</li> <li>• Contrary to purposes of the Green Belt – encroachment into open countryside.</li> <li>• The Green Belt to the East of Tring gives access to and views to/from the AONB which would be lost if any of the options were adopted.</li> <li>• Loss of open space for recreation</li> <li>• A Masterplan will be critical.</li> <li>• The potential country park along the Grand Union Canal might provide limited mitigation.</li> <li>• Highly visible from the surrounding roads – the land is flat and will block longer distance views.</li> <li>• Views to and from the AONB would be detrimentally affected.</li> <li>• Will increase the population of Tring by 60% - this is too much.</li> <li>• Some development close to the town edge could be acceptable.</li> <li>• Has development in the town centre / existing urban area been maximised?</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8832
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring has a thriving community and has the character of a small historic market town. The character of the town will change completely with the plan for 2,730 new dwellings, which could mean over 6,000 more people.</p> <p>The starting point is that ONS still states that it is 2.4 people per household. The figure of around 2,700 houses is reached - taking into account already consented and a predicted windfall number. It is correct to factor those into the ultimate</p>

number, but taking into account the obvious riposte at an inquiry 'that those will be consented free-standing of the Local Plan'. Therefore, the actual numbers for Tring are 2,274 proposed. If you take into account what is proposed and that which is either already consented or predicted to be by windfall, on the 2.4 basis you will get to a 55% increase of the population (if you did not take into account the windfall and already consented, I think the increase would be 45%). An increase taking into account the figures of 2,730 would on the 2.4 basis, equate to 6552 people.

It is worthy of note that in Tring the plot ratios are generous having regard to national guidance i.e. more land is being taken. This perhaps leads to an argument that perhaps there should be a greater concentration of affordable dwellings, but definitely an argument that the Council is proposing an excessive land take.

Most of the developments are proposed on land which is currently in the Green Belt. The amount of development proposed is excessive and would have a significant harmful impact on the character of the town and its surroundings. We would wish to see development concentrated in the existing urban area of the town and concentrating on the reuse of shops and offices and other conversions. If some development is to be allowed on green fields it should be greatly scaled down.

In normal times, Tring Station car park is completely full by 9am on weekdays, so another huge car park would be required at Tring station.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8847

**Person ID** 1266793

**Full Name** Tony Ayles

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that the current and future infrastructure will put a strain on the community. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.

This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8850

**Person ID** 1148361

**Full Name** Joy Kingsbury

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that the current and future infrastructure will put a strain on the community. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum. This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8865

**Person ID** 1266808

**Full Name** Fran Allen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I cannot support the Dacorum local plan for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much building has been proposed on Green Belt Land. More brown field options should be explored.</li> <li>• The growth proposals for Tring are completely disproportionate, unjustified and lacking in valuing its surrounding environment and landscapes.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8890
<b>Person ID</b>	1266829
<b>Full Name</b>	David Thomas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I oppose the Dacorum Local Plan. The scale for development is excessive. Tring is already struggling meeting a suitable infrastructure with the current population level. This proposed development will put pressure on roads, schooling, surgeries etc. Tring is a small market town in an area of natural outstanding beauty surrounded by green belt. This development will destroy the lovely vista from the ridgeway and Aldbury Nowers.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8933
<b>Person ID</b>	1266866

<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Baker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am emailing you as a resident of Dacorum and Tring. I strongly object to the current local housing plan proposals for Dacorum and particularly for Tring.</p> <p>The current plan relies far too much on the use of valuable green belt land. Whilst the government allows for use of some green belt in 'exceptional circumstances' I feel Dacorum are misusing this guideline with the plan using 60% of green belt land. This is not only an unacceptable amount it is also misleading as whilst it maybe 60% in Dacorum overall it is far exceeding 60% of green belt in the proposal for Tring. In fact the majority of the proposal is on current greenbelt land in Tring, which is completely insupportable and wholly objectionable. This massive use of green belt land is damaging to this area of outstanding natural beauty, to our wildlife, ancient hedgerows and general well being. If the current situation has showed us anything it's that people need access to green spaces for their mental health, please don't let all this essential green space be taken from the residents of Tring and Dacorum. One such area within the plans currently used by the children and people of Tring for multiple sports including our local football and rugby teams. This is essential green space that must not be so easily dismissed and built on.</p> <p>The percentage of housing allocated to Tring is double per population head than that planned for the rest of Dacorum. We are a small town and whilst there must be some growth the scope of these plans far exceeds what is necessary, required and sustainable for the town to support. Far too many houses in the wrong places. The amount of housing planned for Tring will overwhelm our small market town, our roads, our local amenities and bring with it greater pollution from the increase in cars and traffic. Our over subscribed schools cannot take more children. The only secondary school in Tring though undergoing a massive rebuild is NOT expanding its capacity for students. The massive housing development therefore will swamp our the school and leave the Dacorum villages surround Tring with no where to go. Once again this is unacceptable. The town in normal times already has full doctors surgeries, over subscribed secondary and primary schools, packed supermarkets and busy roads it cannot take the massive influx of the quantity of new residents suggested in the plans. It will already struggle to accommodate the new residents of the housing developments currently being built on Tring green belt. Our historic town centre was never designed to support such a huge amount of residents and all that those residents bring with them.</p> <p>Please protect our historic market town and our green belt from being over run with ill thought out housing developments. For any future housing developments please stop the unsympathetic building of cramped housing with minimal green spaces and gardens. These housing 'estates' are always of a standard, 'one design fits all' plan by large companies that</p>

do not retain the character of the town. Please go further insisting that the houses built follow the highest levels of sustainable green measures to protect this town, its residents and ultimately this planet for future generations.  
Please stop the current plans, revise the sums of what is needed and most importantly, ensure the plans fit the needs of the local area and it's current residents.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8953
<b>Person ID</b>	1265008
<b>Full Name</b>	Kim Dixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My comments regarding the plan relate to Long Marston and Tring.</p> <p>Flooding – as you should be aware, Long Marston floods regularly. Nothing has been resolved in the 20+ years that I have lived in the village. Additional homes will add to the problem.</p> <p>Rural life – I want to live in a rural location (Long Marston). I don't want to look out of my window onto a huge housing estate. Tring is a traditional small market town. The character of it will be ruined. It will be turned into a soulless urban town. The idea of knocking down historic buildings in Tring and rebuilding them elsewhere is ludicrous.</p> <p>Transport – the majority of people want to/need to use cars to travel. Get real. No amount of cycle lanes and buses will change that. There will be insufficient car parking spaces at Tring station.</p> <p>Roads – Long Marston suffers from speeding traffic and huge lorries on totally unsuitable roads. HCC have ignored the recommendations made by the Parish Council. Additional housing will only add to the problems.</p>

Infrastructure – promises to provide the required additional infrastructure to support the increased population will not be met. There'll be 101 excuses given.

Health – these changes will cause some people, including myself, more stress.

I'd like to conclude by saying that while I thought the report was well written but in some places it was contradictory. The main report indicated that Long Marston wasn't suitable for expansion, yet in one of the appendices it was identified as a potential site for nearly 4k houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8962

**Person ID** 495030

**Full Name** mr philip nash

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I'm pleased to submit my comments about the above proposed plans as follows; though I have tried, I haven't found the access point on your website to complete my response via your Portal (might be me, but I have tried)

- 1 While I understand producing this plan is an obligation for you I do not feel consulted about the process. I have received no information about this plan in its current form which I thought was a mandatory part of the process.
- 1 I do not believe your plan, in its current form, is not in residents of Berkhamsted (where I live) or Tring's best interests and I don't see that you have consulted sufficiently to establish otherwise.

1 Green Belt land should not be included in this plan - The country is committed to protecting the environment and natural flora and fauna are vital to this process and we need to protect this for future generations.

1 I understand that green field sites are an attractive and effective way of providing new housing, as planned around Tring, but I see no evidence that any thought has been given to how Tring with its very narrow main street will be able to accommodate the extra traffic movement that will be caused by the development. The new developments are quite some distance from Tring town centre and shops - there won't be any useful bus services so people will need cars.

Will houses be truly affordable for first time buyers?

Will sufficient houses be available at truly affordable rents for people on minimum wages?

Will houses be provided with proper gardens that are not always in the shade and provide space for natural rainfall drainage so that our underground water supply can be replaced?

Is enough water available for these new houses?

Where will people who need to drive into Tring for the shops, doctors or any other reason, park their cars?

1 Relevant to all of the development you propose;

Where will all of these people go to work?

As it is highly likely they will need to travel beyond Dacorum it is essential that private cars should be designed into the plan and not excluded from it; hopefully cars in the future will be greener, but people are still likely to want to use them. All housing, including flats and maisonettes need to have parking facilities available and secure places to keep other forms of transport e.g bicycles.

1 The plan could mean an extra 60,000 people living in Dacorum. Our current resources for medical support is already stressed with an inadequate hospital provision which is difficult to travel to with worn out buildings on all sites and no plans to bring them up to date with the single rooms and good ventilation which have proved very necessary with COVID; there's also shortage of GPs and NHS dentists.

1 Berkhamsted is already congested and cannot accommodate the extra housing you propose. It is very difficult to navigate through for people going about their work (there are very few jobs in the town and very many people have no option but to drive to work) and the extra traffic will of necessity add to that. Like Tring, there is one main road going through the town and no opportunity for an alternative. The town does not lend itself to mass cycling, and just like a car they have to be left somewhere when not in use at any visited destination (few workplaces can accommodate them)



- 1 Where is the extra drinking water coming from?
- 1 All drainage systems must make their way down hill from both sides of the valley to a main drainage system; can this cope, it's not a green field site so new pipes for all utilities will have to go all over the place making them less efficient.
- 1 All of the developments you have proposed in Berkhamsted need to be accessed through existing urban networks which do not need the extra vehicular movements which will all peak at work travel times and many of that traffic will need to access the High Street and the central cross road junction for other routes.
- 1 As in Tring, where will new local jobs come?
- 1 Bus routes from the town are already infrequent and inadequate.

I realise this is difficult for you but Berkhamsted is already over congested and I have to object to your plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9012

**Person ID** 1263717

**Full Name** Helen Wells

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Whilst appreciating the need for extra housing in the borough, I question the sheer number of dwellings that are planned. In view of the changes to employment caused by the Covid crisis, most forecasts predict that working from home will

increase significantly, once the present outbreak is under control. In many respects, the Covid epidemic has only speeded up an existing trend. Additionally, the present Government has announced its intention to reinvigorate areas in the Midlands and North to increase industrial and business investment and employment opportunities in these areas.

I suggest that , taking into account the Government's policy of moving business out of the Home Counties and the fact that, in this age of electronic communications, distance to work ceases to be a governing factor, large numbers of people will wish to live in a much more reasonably priced area than Dacorum.

In light of these considerations, a reassessment of the Dacorum Local Plan is urgently required.

## **TRING**

I am sure that inhabitants of other towns and villages in the borough are better qualified than I to speak about their local area, but as a resident of Tring, I wish to state my objections to the current plan and to offer some suggestions as to the manner in which I think it can be improved.

## **OBJECTIONS TO CURRENT PLAN**

### **Facilities**

- A 55% increase in housing will alter the entire character of an historic market town. Why has the Council decided that Tring should bear the brunt of this development?
- The town's infrastructure is not capable of sustaining such a large increase in population. I note that the plan does make provision for potential new schools, but many other services are required.
- Car-parking for High Street shopping is at a premium and is one of the factors in the decline of facilities in the town centre. The Council are naïve if they believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities.
- The proposed re-development of the Fire Station and Auction area will exacerbate the car-parking problems. Even Tesco's large car-park is sometimes totally full.

- Most of the proposed housing is distant from the High Street. The surrounding roads are narrow and any further traffic will only add to the present congestion. The Council are naïve if they believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities, especially as the eastern development is distant from the town centre.
- There is a lack of local employment – most new residents are going to be commuters. It is obvious that the proposed employment facilities will be inadequate to cater for the vastly increased population.
- Car-parking at the station is also limited; indeed the Station Car-Park’s own web-site states that even season-ticket holders cannot be guaranteed a parking place after 8 a.m. Many people from surrounding villages use the station and, owing to the car-parking charges, there is a growing tendency for commuters to park in the Grove residential area, thereby causing considerable inconvenience to residents.

#### **Environmental concerns**

- The proposed housing to the east of the town is on Green Belt land. The Chilterns are an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the sheer size of the development will have a serious detrimental effect on a beautiful environment, impacting on valuable farming land.
- The Government, in addition to its policy of focusing housing in the Midlands and North, has announced that it would now be prioritising brownfield sites and urban areas - not Green Belt.
- The Covid crisis has only emphasised the value of green spaces for exercise and leisure to improve mental health. The areas between the town and the canal, especially Marshcroft Lane, are in almost constant use by dog-walkers, cyclists and hikers.

#### **Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9086

**Person ID** 1146072

**Full Name** Helen Cole

#### **Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Tring and strongly object to the proposal to build 2731 new homes here. This will add around 50% to the existing number of homes, which is an excessive increase. Building on this scale will dramatically change the character of our small friendly market town, It will also turn the town into a more longitudinal development. This means that people living in the new homes will be too far from the centre of town to walk there, and will inevitably lead to increased car use and congestion in the town. Houses for older people are proposed, but older people have limited mobility and need to be very close to the town centre in order to remain independent, I therefore fail to see how the proposed location supports the needs of the older community.</p> <p>There does not seem to be an allowance in the figures for social housing, and yet a large amount of the land to be used is council owned. Many people are unable to buy their own homes, or rent without support. I would like to see a large proportion of social housing rather than so called 'affordable housing' which in this area at 80% of market rate is still unaffordable for many.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9088
<b>Person ID</b>	1146072
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Cole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The longitudinal nature of the proposed development in Tring will result in loss of amenity for all the residents who like to access the countryside for exercise. During the pandemic many more people have explored the area on foot and by bike, and a large proportion can access beautiful countryside in minutes via Marshcroft Lane. The new housing will turn this beautiful countryside into an urban area. The inevitable consequence is that instead of walking or cycling to the countryside from home, people will get in their cars and drive further afield, resulting in increased traffic, congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>On the map there are shown two possible additional schools. Tring currently has one infants, one junior and two primary schools and one secondary school. It is not clear how these possible new schools will support the additional families and what numbers of children they will cater for. I am also unclear on any plans to expand the provision of rail services, transport to and parking at the station, or doctors surgeries. Development of additional space for retail to the detriment of Dunsley Farm and the market square and museum seems odd given that we already have many empty retail premises on the High Street and the trend is more towards shopping online (which is acknowledged in the supporting documents).</p> <p>In conclusion I feel that as it stands this local plan misses an opportunity to think creatively about increased housing provision in Dacorum. If green belt land is to be sacrificed, then needs of residents would be better served by new self sufficient towns with all the associated infrastructure and amenities, rather than bolt-ons to existing towns. The opportunity to bake in specific targets to support climate change goals also seemed to have been missed. Specifically the proposed expansion in Tring is way too large and the proposed increase in housing density is unacceptable, this will totally change the character of the town to the detriment of all residents.</p>
--	---

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9113
<b>Person ID</b>	1267080
<b>Full Name</b>	Louise Shenton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Tring I am greatly concerned by your poorly planned Housing Plan. It simultaneously wastes resources, damages beautiful countryside and fails to make appropriate investment to support the growth.</p> <p>As it neither allows for local jobs nor support for the strain to the commuting population it serves no purpose for the people you are expected to support.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9175
<b>Person ID</b>	1267160
<b>Full Name</b>	NICKY & RICHARD OAKES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We note with dismay the proposals in Dacorum Local Plan, 2020 to 2038 "Shaping Growth in Dacorum", "Key Developments in Tring" show proposed extensive new housing and a "potential" new school situated directly south west of Northchurch and ending at the A41 as well as encroaching on Green Belt land in an AONB.</p> <p>My husband and I are residents of Tring, a small market town with limited resources and space. We cannot see how it will cope with any further drastic increase in traffic, people and demand on utilities that the Dacorum proposal sets out.</p> <p>The increase in school traffic alone, added to existing commuter traffic, is enough to heighten the potential for delay or accident using the narrow lanes in rush hour.</p> <p>In addition, the increased load on the local infrastructure will put stress on existing services such as schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals and parking. Proposals such as these will change the character of hitherto traditional market towns permanently, whilst we understand and appreciate the need for progress the extent and scope should be addressed, reviewed and revised to avoid this.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9185
<b>Person ID</b>	1264324
<b>Full Name</b>	David Wells
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to you to register my discontent with the proposed development plan for Tring. As a lifelong resident of Tring, I am horrified by the prospect of a 55% increase in the amount of houses, as it will irreversibly alter the character of the town. I am at a loss as to why the council feels that Tring must be the one to bear the most significant burden of the development plan. In addition to this, such intensive construction will cause significant damage to precious Green Belt land, which is meant to protect our local area from such developments, depriving us of some wonderful countryside that is enjoyed by all, particularly in recent times with the restrictions imposed by the Pandemic.</p> <p>The issues with local infrastructure in Tring must be taken into account. Even at its present size, much of the infrastructure in Tring is problematic. Parking is frequently an issue and the town's current provision along the High Street and nearby areas is frankly already insufficient. Given the distance that these new proposed houses are from the town centre, it is inevitable that people will drive, instead of walk. Many have a tendency to do so already. The proposal to build on the site of the Forge Car Park, as well as adding the new supermarket on the site of the auction house and fire station, will make an already difficult situation considerably worse. Other infrastructure issues to consider include the town's healthcare provision, of which I see no mention in the plan. The Rothschild House Surgery, in addition to the difficulties of parking nearby, is already incredibly busy and the wait for an appointment, on the rare occasion I have to make one, is considerable. I see nothing in the plan that will help deal with these very pressing issues.</p> <p>The increase will also have a significant effect on the infrastructure outside the town, most notably at Tring Station. Both the bike racks and the Car Park at Tring Station, in normal times, are frequently full by 08:00. It is not uncommon for those who cannot get a car parking space to park on residential streets nearby and walk, exacerbating issues of congestion in the town, particularly on the eastern side where I live.</p>

Whilst the station issue very much depends on future working patterns, I would also question whether these new houses are in fact needed, given the events of the last year, when working from home has been the norm. Given a lack of local jobs in the area, and the fact that a sizable proportion of Tring residents commute into London in normal times, is any need for such extensive new housing in the area when it is likely that working from home will be more widespread? It is unnecessary to add all these new homes into a commuter town, especially as there is a real possibility that the population of the town may even decrease given this shift in working patterns.

With final regard as to the need for this development, I understand government policy has changed in regards to housing, choosing instead to focus on a regeneration of the Midlands and the North of England and the employment and industries of those regions. Further to this, they have chosen to focus development of housing on brownfield land and in urban areas. With the so called "mutant algorithm", as it became known, now abandoned, there is no impetus for large amounts of further construction in the South East or Dacorum more specifically, especially in Green Belt areas.

In light of these considerations, I can only conclude that the Dacorum Local Plan is unnecessary, out of date and should be abandoned. If there is to be any further development in the local area, much greater consideration must be given to the impact that it will have the character of our towns, surrounding countryside and our already strained infrastructure.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9187
<b>Person ID</b>	1259870
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanna Greaves
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**As a resident of Tring, I feel utterly disappointed that my local council are considering this expansion. Tring is a lovely town. I moved here for the aesthetics, the school, the green space and thoroughly enjoy the tring triangle areas. What a great place to live.**

If this expansion goes ahead, you are dumping over 6000 more cars into the area. You will be destroying are beautiful open spaces. Our views will be ruined and the areas which have given great relief to the residents during a year long lock down will disappear.

I moved to tring for its continued interest and ability to keep the town green. To combat our environmental footprint and now the council are considering only money and cash flow, how depressing. By accepting this expansion you are considering only money and growth of the worst kind.

Think of the people. The plan is absolutely abhorrent and utterly selfish for the minority who gain financially. Let's not ruin Tring. Let Tring recover from Covid and grow with further green areas and local independent shops. Let's not destroy car park areas and let's not bring stress and strain to our local doctors and schools, who have been absolute heroes and continue to be.

I ask you to consider the residents and not be blinded by self gain.

Tring is a beautiful town. Your expansion will bring nothing to the people who live in it except shaded gardens and blocked views. Further pollution and a strain on our resources. Please do not green light this expansion.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9294
<b>Person ID</b>	1267333
<b>Full Name</b>	JO MURPHY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9315
<b>Person ID</b>	1267332
<b>Full Name</b>	Nandi Jordan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Berkhamsted and Tring Labour Party
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files** [ATTACHMENT TO COMMENT EGS9315.jpg](#)

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9335

**Person ID** 1267355

**Full Name** Diana Cole

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

At the beginning of the pandemic, I, like hundreds of other, enjoyed my daily exercise down Marshcroft Lane or along London Road, appreciating the natural beauty of the area, even marvelling how peaceful the A41 was.. However it didn't last long. The problems of the A41 returned, especially going into Aylesbury. I couldn't understand why the local roads were so busy -Station Road, Northfield Road, all the roads over the canal bridges and even Beggars Lane - and this in Lockdown - where had all these people come from.

Then you come up with a so called sustainable plan which will increase the population by 55%.

The plan for Tring meets none of your quoted objectives,

Please explain how building on green belt protects the natural environment or the historic town has been protected.

There is no plan for infrastructure - we only have one arterial road, the local roads are relics of a bygone age - are the canal bridges to be swept aside.

I realise that Dacorum needs starter homes but not by destroying Tring.

You seem to accept the government's figures but these are already based on out of date information. You accept the disproportionate burden on boroughs like ours even though the infrastructure cannot take anymore - the trains are full and the M1 and M25 are at full capacity. The Green Belt was designed to protect us from over development.

You accept the figures despite the fact that no one knows the long term effects of the pandemic, Brexit or the upcoming census. You produce a plan despite neighbouring authorities postponing theirs. Tring in particular will be as much affected by the evergrowing Aylesbury as developments in Hemel.

Giving free rein to developers to build around Tring will not reduce your housing list. They will not build starter homes in prime locations.

I fail to understand what Tring has done to deserve your plan.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9345

**Person ID** 1267365

**Full Name** Mr Jont Cole

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9422

**Person ID** 1267394

**Full Name** MIKE RIEMER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am very strongly opposed to the proposed extensions to all housing areas in Dacorum, but particularly Tring. An increase of 55% of housing will be highly detrimental to the character of this old Market Town.

As pointed out already, the demand placed for this housing is based on outdated census information, that is both pre-Brexit and pre-Covid! Will this demand be reconsidered once things return to normal operation? There is not enough industry and work opportunities in the town to support this new population, which would add strain to the already oversubscribed road and transport networks.

I also notice a distinct lack of provision of healthcare, transport, sporting facilities. Current Train transport to London is insufficient in peak times, and the proximity to the M1 and M25 are no drawcard, as these are essentially gridlocked at the moment, adding to those options is not presented in the solution.

The current NHS hospitals and GP practices that service the area are all completely over-run and in short supply, yet there is no provision at all for this in the plans! Our local hospital in Aylesbury is already under strain, notwithstanding the growth occurring in Aylesbury and its surrounding area, which falls outside the Dacorum boundaries. Doubling the population needs to double every service. Pre-Covid, Stoke-Mandeville hospital had to close their doors due to lack of capacity and beds being full. The current plans will only make this worse.

I see no interest in trying to maintain the feel of the town in these plans. Instead, they are trying to fit as much profit into as small a space as possible. Growth Area TR05 for example, is in an area where the road will have to be widened into the proposed site and has provision for 24 new houses. This is in an area where on the opposite side of the road you have 5 houses in a similar area, and the direct neighbouring houses would have twice as much space as is being proposed. If this is not trying to ruin the feel of the area, it should only contain a maximum of 11 houses!

At the same time, we see discussions about sustainability and eco-housing, but no standards or penalties for buildings that fail to comply to those standards – how will they be inspected and held to account? At the same time there is no provision for improving the existing services in the area. We have recently had emergency gas works in our road – 200m from the proposed TR05 – where the mains Gas pipe is only 3mm in places. This causes low pressure (and us failing a gas certificate inspection) when there is a surge in demand – neighbours did not have heating for 2-3 days as a result!

The proposed plans to develop Dunsley farm will destroy an area already with some commercial development but will ruin the approach into Tring from the A41 and alter its rural feel.

I have major concerns with this proposal, and the impact it is going to have on every facet of this village and the rural joy everyone who lives here experiences.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9429
<b>Person ID</b>	1267396
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDY & ANN-MARIE EVANS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As residents of Tring, our comments below relate to the Tring parts of the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst growth of a small amount is always to be accepted. The “target” calculation for this plan is based on an old method as many will have pointed out and does not have to be the target figure.</li> <li>• Currently, the suggested amount of housing for the Tring area is totally out of keeping with the character of the town. It is currently a small historic market town and this plan would change this irrevocably An increase of 55% is a ridiculously high figure.</li> <li>• Where possible, houses should be built on brownfield land, in the existing urban areas of Tring, and away from areas located in the Green Belt (which should only be used in exceptional circumstances) . Just because an arbitrary target figure has been used, does not warrant exceptional circumstance</li> <li>• The document does not detail any valid reason for building on the Green Belt other than the increase in housing itself</li> <li>• Whilst the plan includes some admirable titles such as sustainable transport – the plan lacks any clear guidance how it will be improved, never mind improved at such an amount for the level of housing that is being suggested</li> <li>• Great to have more paths and cycle paths but realistically these houses will create far too much vehicle traffic</li> <li>• During this pandemic, it has highlighted the simplicity of a local walk in the nearby countryside. Building over this countryside at the edge of the town will remove this simple but necessary pleasure</li> <li>• Not enough care has been taken to protect the local ecology - the demand for water will damage the aquifer and the internationally recognised chalk streams</li> <li>• The houses proposed will encourage people to use cars as they are not near employment or transport hubs.</li> </ul>

Whilst the plan includes the right titles such as sustainability, climate change, biodiversity etc it unfortunately fails to deliver a solution to these issues/aims.

To be honest it simply comes across as a mathematical calculation to drive extra housing, with new estates being simply bolted onto existing areas with a loss of the local Green Belt for the profit of property developers

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9462

**Person ID** 1267404

**Full Name** Mr Simon Devine

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Please find attached my thoughts on the crazy idea of mindlessly doubling the population of Tring.

Tring is a wonderful place to live and should be preserved as a jewel in Dacorum's crown rather than just another massive housing development.

I sincerely hope you take this feedback onboard when making your decision to cancel the plan to build on the land around Tring.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9466

**Person ID** 1267412

**Full Name** Professor Michael Hutt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My wife and I have lived in Tring since 1985 and we love the town and its surrounding area. I would like to object very strongly to the proposals for Tring in the Dacorum Borough Plan. My reasons are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 An increase of over 50% in Tring's housing stock and population would alter the nature of the town beyond recognition, and appears to be totally out of proportion to local or national need. It is of course natural that a town will grow, but if its growth is to be sustainable it needs to be organic, gradual, and driven by its residents' wishes and needs. I suspect that the proposed development will be opposed by the entire population of Tring –not driven by nimbyism, but by a genuine concern for the future of their town.</li> <li>2 Tring has already made a substantial contribution to the expansion of housing in Dacorum, with a major development underway between Icknield Way and Aylesbury Road. There has also already been a great deal of infill housing: in my part of town, the John Smith lorry yard has already been given over to new housing, and the Akeman industrial estate is now going the same way. I am very concerned about the proposal to build yet more houses in the Brook Street/market area. We need open spaces within our town, not just beyond its perimeters, which in any case will become more distant from the town centre if these proposals are implemented.</li> <li>3 The introduction to the local environment of literally thousands of additional cars would either lead to serious congestion in Tring's central streets, or necessitate the construction of a new road layout that would destroy the character of the town centre entirely. Even now, one vehicle parked temporarily to unload in the high street can cause long queues of traffic to build up in both directions. Parking will become an even greater problem than at present. (Address removed) is completely choked with parked cars during business hours every day.</li> <li>4 Given the council's performance to date, I have little confidence that there will be any adequate provision for other modes of local transport. There isn't even a right of way for cyclists on the so-called 'cycle path' to Tring Station between Cow Lane and the Brook Street roundabout. I regularly cycle up to the Tesco supermarket, and mine is invariably the only bicycle parked there.</li> <li>5 The proposed development between Station Road and Bulbourne will lose us a substantial swathe of green belt habitat and impact adversely on nearby AONBs. In recent months, the local countryside has become more important for our mental and physical health than it has ever been. A proposal to destroy or compromise an extensive green space appears to me to be badly out of step with the times.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9477
<b>Person ID</b>	1157289
<b>Full Name</b>	Rodney O'Callaghan

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9479
<b>Person ID</b>	1157289
<b>Full Name</b>	Rodney O'Callaghan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.</p> <p>TR01 consists of 37.25 hectares; it is understood that 5.4 hectares of this land is proposed to be given over to employment land with a further 3 hectares given over to a school. A reasonable outer urban environment density ratio for this area, accounting for a requirement for open space would be 30 dwellings per hectare which at 28 available hectares provides a provision of 840 dwellings.</p> <p>Within a more urbanised environment, that which should be explored before any further allocation is provided, at 40 dwellings per hectare, the site could be available to provide circa 1,100 dwellings. It is not clear therefore why based upon the provisions of the site's size and allocation strategy a capped rate of circa 14/15 dwellings per hectare is sought to be provided given that the site would be expected to provide a varied housing mix. Such a density ratio would be low even for a scheme of large executive family homes and certainly fails to meet the Frameworks expectations of efficiently making use of brownfield land. If this land is built upon then I support the need for affordable starter homes to be constructed, not large executive family homes.</p> <p>Given the importance of justification for any Green Belt allocation that can be proven to exist, significantly greater detail on the allocation strategy for the Tr01 site should be provided given that by way of comparison, and in assessment of the Council's own Green Belt Review Evidence, it offers the least significant impact by comparison to other allocated sites.</p> <p>With regard specific comments in relation to sites Tr02 and Tr03, these are raised in relation to the delivery strategy of Question 4; I consider that the allocation of such land is highly inappropriate and would offer a substantial collective impact upon both the Green Belt and AONB that has not been justified in planning policy terms.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9482

<b>Person ID</b>	1157289
<b>Full Name</b>	Rodney O'Callaghan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.</p> <p>TR01 consists of 37.25 hectares; it is understood that 5.4 hectares of this land is proposed to be given over to employment land with a further 3 hectares given over to a school. A reasonable outer urban environment density ratio for this area, accounting for a requirement for open space would be 30 dwellings per hectare which at 28 available hectares provides a provision of 840 dwellings.</p> <p>Within a more urbanised environment, that which should be explored before any further allocation is provided, at 40 dwellings per hectare, the site could be available to provide circa 1,100 dwellings. It is not clear therefore why based upon the provisions of the site's size and allocation strategy a capped rate of circa 14/15 dwellings per hectare is sought to be provided given that the site would be expected to provide a varied housing mix. Such a density ratio would be low even for a scheme of large executive family homes and certainly fails to meet the Frameworks expectations of efficiently making use of brownfield land. If this land is built upon then I support the need for affordable starter homes to be constructed, not large executive family homes.</p> <p>Given the importance of justification for any Green Belt allocation that can be proven to exist, significantly greater detail on the allocation strategy for the Tr01 site should be provided given that by way of comparison, and in assessment of the Council's own Green Belt Review Evidence, it offers the least significant impact by comparison to other allocated sites.</p> <p>With regard specific comments in relation to sites Tr02 and Tr03, these are raised in relation to the delivery strategy of Question 4; I consider that the allocation of such land is highly inappropriate and would offer a substantial collective impact upon both the Green Belt and AONB that has not been justified in planning policy terms.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9483
<b>Person ID</b>	1157289
<b>Full Name</b>	Rodney O'Callaghan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.</p> <p>TR01 consists of 37.25 hectares; it is understood that 5.4 hectares of this land is proposed to be given over to employment land with a further 3 hectares given over to a school. A reasonable outer urban environment density ratio for this area, accounting for a requirement for open space would be 30 dwellings per hectare which at 28 available hectares provides a provision of 840 dwellings.</p> <p>Within a more urbanised environment, that which should be explored before any further allocation is provided, at 40 dwellings per hectare, the site could be available to provide circa 1,100 dwellings. It is not clear therefore why based upon the provisions of the site's size and allocation strategy a capped rate of circa 14/15 dwellings per hectare is sought to be provided given that the site would be expected to provide a varied housing mix. Such a density ratio would be low even for a scheme of large executive family homes and certainly fails to meet the Frameworks expectations of efficiently making use of brownfield land. If this land is built upon then I support the need for affordable starter homes to be constructed, not large executive family homes.</p> <p>Given the importance of justification for any Green Belt allocation that can be proven to exist, significantly greater detail on the allocation strategy for the Tr01 site should be provided given that by way of comparison, and in assessment of the Council's own Green Belt Review Evidence, it offers the least significant impact by comparison to other allocated sites.</p>

With regard specific comments in relation to sites Tr02 and Tr03, these are raised in relation to the delivery strategy of Question 4; I consider that the allocation of such land is highly inappropriate and would offer a substantial collective impact upon both the Green Belt and AONB that has not been justified in planning policy terms.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9575

**Person ID** 1264671

**Full Name** Mr and Mrs Dan Harris

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Following a review of the Dacorum development plan to 2038 and being residents in Tring, we're concerned with the proposed plans to increase housing by 55% in Tring. Particularly when it appears there's little provision to expanding / improving infrastructure that exists today. Our objections are as follows:

- Doctors & Hospitals: It's unclear as to the provision for these services with such a significant increase. I'm not sure Stoke Mandeville could cope as it stands today with the increase in housing across Aylesbury and Tring.
- A41: Already very stretched at rush hour times. This road will see a significant increase in usage when you review the other plans in place across Dacorum and Aylesbury Vale. I understand there are plans to have thousands of homes at the top of the A41. There will need to be a change to this road.
- Linked to the above Train station comments - it's not clear how the provision for additional road users is being considered along Station Road or Northfield Road (from Pitstone) as it stands today these roads are already very busy particularly during peak hours.
- The High Street today is already very busy from a traffic perspective made even worse with large vehicles and buses. An additional 3000+ homes in Tring without a clear plan for the high street doesn't work.
- Train station: the parking provision at the station is already stretched. Prior to COVID-19 it was usually difficult to find a car parking space after 8:30. People are then left to park their cars wherever they can find space sometimes at the danger to pedestrians and other road users. There will need to be extensive changes to the parking provision at the train station. This is not mentioned in the plan.
- Infrastructure:

- A large proportion of the housing is planned to be in the fields behind grove road. Whilst I'm aligned that it may be a good location for additional housing, the volume of proposed houses is significant. This is a cause for concern with regards to traffic, firstly on Station Road but also down Grove Road and surrounding areas
- On initial review of the plans, not all are in keeping with a traditional market town - Any approved plans must remain in keeping with the current town.

We are not opposed to additional housing however, the proposed increased housing as it stands today is extremely excessive considering the lack of additional infrastructure. It is also clear that Tring is proposed to take a disproportionate increase when compared to other local towns.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9586

**Person ID** 1267451

**Full Name** James and Vicki Gentle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

In response to the Tring Local Plan.

We have read through the proposals for the Tring Local Plan and have the following concerns.

- 1 There seems to be a lack of information regarding social housing and very little social housing proposed. The proposal of over 2,000 houses is very big in relation to the size of Tring and will put a strain on local services.
- 2 The report mentions environmental concerns but there is no mention of sustainable transport links, cycle paths, low carbon transport or sustainable energy developments e.g. charging points for electric cars. How will the proposed development promote green energy/low carbon footprint? Very little detail of how this will be managed.
- 3.. There are hardly any green spaces e.g. parks to make up for the Green Belt and farm land that the development is proposed on. How does this promote healthy living and environmental awareness? How will developers promote biodiversity e.g through wildlife corridors.
  - 1 How will the current infrastructure of Tring be developed e.g. services, schools, doctors. We can see proposals e.g. for a new school but little detail regarding this and how Tring will deal with a marked increase in population.

It seems there is a real opportunity to promote a sustainable and forward thinking development but little detail as to how this will be achieved. The numbers of houses proposed are very large in relation to Tring's size and has been presented as a fait accompli, but is this really the case?. We support the motions proposed by the local organisation Tring in Transition regarding transport, energy, sustainable development. and enhancing the local environment. . We need to bring environmental concerns to the forefront of national and local policies or risk permanent damage to the environment as well as a loss of the character of the town.

To quote Tring in Transition ' Considering that the environmental/climate impact of the developments enabled by the local plan will last for several generations and could be enormous, we feel it would be better for DBC to be vastly more ambitious in their target setting, to the benefit of the climate, the local population, and achieving NPPF requirement for presumption of sustainable development, climate change mitigation, and moving to a low/zero carbon future.'

We also want to achieve:

'A Rothschild legacy, of forward thinking development, respect for the environment, bold and challenging designs and solutions'

We feel the local plan needs to be more ambitious in these respects in order to leave a lasting and sustainable development for the generations of the future and of which residents can be proud.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9605

**Person ID** 1263214

**Full Name** Mr R Pope

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

- Why is seen expedient to virtually double the size of Tring? I understand it has good access to the A41 road but the station is almost 2 miles from the town centre. Tring is already a dormitory town. Your proposed development cannot be seen as environmentally sound. Where are the local jobs to be found in Tring? Only one symbol on your development plan of Tring indicates a small 'new employment' area.



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9606
<b>Person ID</b>	1267455
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms C Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is seen expedient to virtually double the size of Tring? I understand it has good access to the A41 road but the station is almost 2 miles from the town centre. Tring is already a dormitory town. Your proposed development cannot be seen as environmentally sound. Where are the local jobs to be found in Tring? Only one symbol on your development plan of Tring indicates a small 'new employment' area.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9646
<b>Person ID</b>	400471
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Ruth Constable
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>In the Delivery Strategy, Tring is taking a disproportionate number of houses compared with other towns in Dacorum: I object to this.</p> <p>Dacorum Council needs to show exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt land for housing and its strategy does not show this. The 1800 homes in TR02 and TR03 would clearly destroy the open grassland and meadows at the foot of the Chilterns AONB. These areas are highly valued for their unique local biodiversity, the environmental and health benefits they bring and for their contribution to the whole particular Chiltern landscape. Their destruction cannot accord with environmental objectives stated elsewhere.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9736
<b>Person ID</b>	1267484
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Wagstaff
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Housing numbers</b> - The plan represents a 24% increase in houses in Berkhamsted and 50% increase in Tring. I do not consider that the plan includes proposals for the significant additional infrastructure that would be required to support this, road improvements, traffic flow, water supply / drainage etc in what are already highly congested towns. Furthermore the council seems to have just accepted targets dictated by central government rather than challenging them based on the unique circumstances of the local area.</p> <p><b>Health and welfare considerations</b> - The plan does not make significant proposals to improve walking, cycling or public transport routes and nor does it provide improvements to public open spaces. The wildlife corridors proposed are narrow strips and no meaningful explanation is provided about how these will support habitats. The land proposed for use is greenbelt and my understanding is that whilst this is permitted, government policy is that this should only be in exceptional circumstances. I am not convinced that the proposals set out justify this in any way.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b> - the plan predominantly proposes housing at the edge of town in hilly areas. It is inevitable that this will lead to reliance on travel in and out of already congested towns. This will lead to poorer air quality.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9742
<b>Person ID</b>	1267502
<b>Full Name</b>	Mike and Sarah Doyle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are very concerned about the proposed key developments in Tring.</p> <p>There is already a large development underway on the western edge of Tring. Even this development will have a detrimental effect on the services in Tring ie parking, surgeries, schools, roads and access to the station. To increase Tring further will put even more strain on these services.</p> <p>The proposed development between Tring and the railway station to the north of Station Road and the development between the A4251 and Cow Lane would totally change the character of Tring, a unique small town at the foot of the Chilterns, and would damage the setting of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It would also entail building on farmland that frequently floods in wet weather.</p> <p>There is no suggestion as to how the increased traffic involved would be handled. Tring is already congested at rush hour and the central car parks are full for most of the day.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9826
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9845
<b>Person ID</b>	1267733
<b>Full Name</b>	JULIE COOK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plans for Tring are going to have a devastating impact on the environment and local wildlife bats hedgehogs deer badgers etc. The current provision of wildlife corridors will not migrate the impact on the wildlife of building of over 2000 new houses. They need to be significantly enhanced.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9868
<b>Person ID</b>	1267754
<b>Full Name</b>	DIANE HOLLIDAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>A lot of work has gone into your planning for the future.</p> <p>Unfortunately I do not accept that the plans suggested are practical.</p> <p>Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring are very pleasant towns/villages but they are already reaching a point of being overcrowded. They are small market towns. There has already been much building .</p> <p>The main road goes through the centre of each of them, causing obstruction, pollution, danger and noise. To add a further mass of houses would cause further problems. I do not see how there is room to change the size and safety of the roads.</p> <p>Following the building of the bypass I cannot see how even more cars could be accommodated. Not to mention the parking.</p>

There is also the problem of the difficulty in managing the increasing services necessary to a larger community. These services are stretched already.

I am very disturbed at the idea of building on the valuable and treasured Green Belt.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9879

**Person ID** 1265080

**Full Name** Ciara & Lee Kennedy-Washington

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The identity of Tring is that of a market town with a beautiful high street filled with independent shops and cafes. These features are the charm of the town and what makes it an attractive place to live and work.

Building an additional supermarket in the town centre will have a significantly adverse effect on the businesses and town with an increase in traffic. Brook Street is already a very difficult street to drive down with cars parked along one side of the road.

The open green spaces around Tring are necessary for the town's boundary and also to provide an essential wildlife corridor.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9902

**Person ID** 1267767

**Full Name** LAUREN CLARKE

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p> <p>We immediately need to have thought on the environment. The flooding we get from excessive rainfall is already high and to think of how bad it will be once these houses are built is unimaginable!</p> <p>Climate change and damage on the environment and we're proposing to build more houses?!?!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9906
<b>Person ID</b>	1267771
<b>Full Name</b>	LORRAINE DUNNE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a strain on the current and future infrastructure on the community.</p>

It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.

This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9925

**Person ID** 1267776

**Full Name** Will Garbutt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident of Northchurch Common, I am writing to register my concern and express my astonishment and disgust at plans for the proposed massive housing expansion projects and developments in the Tring, Berkhamsted & Northchurch area. My reasons are:-

1. The overall amount of houses across the borough is disproportionate to current population growth figures.
  - 1 No thought to the impact on the impact on congestion of roads which are small and largely already in a very bad state.
  - 2 This is greenbelt land and needs to be conserved for delicate ecosystems of wild animals, insects, plants and trees.
  - 3 No clarity on whether these 17,000 extra house in the proposal will be affordable
  5. The impact on overcrowding of school places dwindling for current residents, many of which moved to the area at great expense to get a better education for their children.
  - 4 The impact on climate change will be huge at a time when we need to taking great care to scale back on damage to the environment.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS9935
<b>Person ID</b>	1267774
<b>Full Name</b>	AATMA SEESURRUN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9955
<b>Person ID</b>	1267788
<b>Full Name</b>	SARAH LANGER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I wish to register my objection to the housing plans for Tring. There are many reasons, including the fact that, like the mess you have made of Berkhamsted, a town in which I was born and lived for nearly 30 years, the infrastructure will not cope.  Equally I like the majority of my generation do not live in Tring to be overrun by new build estates. You will destroy what makes Tring what it is and should remain - a market town.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9956
<b>Person ID</b>	1264760
<b>Full Name</b>	Shani Bragg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to add my voice of concern to the proposed extension plans for Tring building on Green Belt Land and expanding the size of Tring to an excessive extent.</p> <p>I am concerned about both the environmental costs of this expansion as well as the strain this will put on our local community and facilities.</p> <p>I would ask that the plans be reviewed and reconsidered to ensure the best is done for the environment and for local communities.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9960
<b>Person ID</b>	1267789
<b>Full Name</b>	RICHARD WILNE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write to object to the proposed Dacorum local plan.</p> <p>The number of houses proposed for Dacorum will alter the character of the area from rural with defined villages and market towns to a suburban sprawl. No explanation has been put forward justifying this detrimental change.</p> <p>I am in particular shocked at the proposed massive expansion of Tring. We are all accustomed to new building and resigned to new housing estates built in the new placeless vernacular of the large developers, but the scale of the proposed changes is unacceptable.</p> <p>The great achievement of post war planning is to prevent urban sprawl, using the Green Belt to keep towns distinct and separate. The proposed developments between Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead suggest that councillors and officials have failed to comprehend the legacy handed down to them and have no intention of living up to it.</p> <p>I understand the grounds by which Green Belt land may be released for development and do not consider these to have been met. I do not have confidence in the council's forecasts of housing need or the analysis on which these are based; nor do I have confidence that these are robust as a forward-looking exercise given the as yet unknown effects of the pandemic on patterns of work and family formation, on the apparent migration from London and the resulting changes to the capital, on the future requirements for currently commercial premises in our towns, and on the effects of population size in the wake of Covid and Brexit, with the Economic Statistics Centre of Excellence having recently estimated that 1.3 million foreign-born residents have left the UK.</p> <p>Given this uncertainty, it seems shortsighted to 'lock in' the destruction through irreversible change of a much cherished area by reliance on estimates that simply cannot bear the weight being placed on them.</p> <p>I am acutely conscious of the environmental impacts inherent in the proposed plans. In particular, the effect on the chalk streams within the area will be profound. The dry upper reaches of the river Ver upstream from St Albans should be a minatory lesson for all involved in this decision and I urge all officials and councillors involved to walk this route and subsequently justify to themselves and residents why this should be inflicted on the rivers Gade and Bulbourne.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS10028
<b>Person ID</b>	871311
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Stephen Kitchener
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I find that the thought of adding what amounts to a new town to Tring, unconscionable.</p> <p>Adding a new town onto and into an existing town, such as Tring, in the hope that it will integrate into the existing infrastructure is misdirected, positioned next to the railway on the north east edge of the existing town, will in effect create a dormitory area where residents would be forced to travel to work (as there is little industry or jobs for 2000+ residents) either via the railway or use their own transportation to get to work. Yes there are schools for the children , but there would be little work for their parents and they have to live and work also to support themselves and their children.</p> <p>The strain on the road network, the lack of parking (for the proposed new store in the center of town) would also alter the nature of the very historic town. There is no space for this. Only an expanded and more regular bus service may help if residents can be persuaded to use this. In addition to the strain on the local road network, Refuse collection, water supply and the green belt will be effected. Yes you can replant and "make new green areas" but once an environment has been destroyed it takes many many years to become fully natural. There is no replacement for leaving it alone. Areas effected will loose their wildlife and may never ever return.</p> <p>More local traffic, residents traveling to and from work will greatly effect the noble intentions of building a low carbon area. If you are going to build low carbon housing an residents are forced to travel for food, work and play, you are defeating the object of low carbon.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10030
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to put in my objections to the local for Tring as follows</p> <p>1) Too much loss of green belt and farm land</p> <p>Green belt needs to be protected for future generations and to help with Global warming and if we keep building we will have less land to grow food to save importing and Rain to be absorb so more flooding.</p> <p>2) Watford Hospital</p> <p>Watford hospital cannot cope now and with all the extra residents from Tring, Berkhamsted, Hemel , Kings Langley even with the new expansion it will not cope also it is in the wrong place especially if a football match is on it is impossible to get to with all this new development we need another Hospital</p> <p>3) Countryside</p> <p>If you take into account how much land has been lost around are local area for housing and HS2 it is already far to much and needs to be stopped for a while allowing nature to adapt</p> <p>4) Wildlife</p> <p>We need wildlife and Trees we as a country cannot keep destroying</p> <p>5) Population</p>

Where do all these people live now where are they coming from

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10033

**Person ID**

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

9) Jobs

Tring does not have enough jobs for its residents now all these extra houses will create more cars on the roads as more people will need to commute

10) Facilities

In your new plans for Tring there is no mention of a new doctors surgery or dentist the facilities are already stretched and would not be able to cope

11) Forward thinking

All new houses should be built with super insulation, Solar panels environmentally friendly none of which has been mentioned and nothing has been mentioned about protection of wildlife

12) Tring

We are a Market town we do not want it spoilt by too many house being built clogging up our high street with lots of extra cars and extra pollution our rural life needs to be protected we love being surrounded by green spaces this is good for the planet and our mental health

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10037

**Person ID** 218427

**Full Name** Mr Bruce Kent

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Tring.

I lived in Tring for 20 years, before moving to Northchurch.

Tring is a small town with great character, based upon a small varied High Street, with the Church in a central location and the town centre with walking distance from anywhere in the town. The annual Victorian Evening with the High Street closed to traffic exemplifies the friendly environment of a small town. It also has the unique feature of a station located 2 miles outside the town.

Releasing a huge single area between the town and the Station will destroy the unique character of the separation of the town from the Station, and the size of the proposed development will destroy the character of the town and turn it into one huge housing estate, with the "town centre" located on the edge of the town .

If the occupiers are working, the assumption that they will be commuters is now suspect from the reasons set out above. If driving, they are furthest from the access to the by-pass. This will result in a huge increase in traffic in Grove Road and Cow Lane. Today, as I drove past, there had been yet another accident at the junction of Cow Lane and the main road as this location is already a highly dangerous junction.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10086
<b>Person ID</b>	1268034
<b>Full Name</b>	MR IAN GUNTER-JONES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated</p>



with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10094

**Person ID** 1261831

**Full Name** Ian Wells

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**TRING**

Having lived in Tring for over 30 years we have seen the increasing congestion within the town. This has arisen by the continued infill developments during that time. We are currently faced with the prospect of yet more congestion arising from the developments on the west of the town. Given their distance from the supermarket, school and other facilities it would be naïve to believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities and do the school runs.

The proposed 55% increase in housing will alter the entire character of an historic market town. Moreover, **the Green Belt exists to stop just this sort of development.** If these proposals go ahead and are followed by similar mega schemes, we will see a continuous linear development from Berkhamsted to Aylesbury by 2050.

While the plan does make provision for new primary(?) schools, many other services are required including secondary school provision.

As stated above, car parking for High Street shopping is at a premium and is one of the factors in the decline of facilities in the town centre. The proposed re-development of the Fire Station and Auction area will merely exacerbate the car-parking problems. Tesco's car-park is, in normal times, frequently full.

Putting a new supermarket in the town centre is ludicrous if that is what is indeed proposed. It would be better at the Icknield Way end to serve the west end communities.

New local employment does not seem to figure highly in the proposals hence most new residents are going to be commuters. It is obvious that the proposed employment facilities will be inadequate to cater for the vastly increased population and hence new residents will have to use either the train or cars to get to work.

Car-parking at the station is severely limited; indeed, the Station Car-Park's own web-site states that even season-ticket holders cannot be guaranteed a parking place after 8 a.m. Many people from surrounding villages Pitstone and Cheddington in particular both of which have expanded significantly in recent years, now are using the station and, owing to the car-parking charges, there is a growing tendency for commuters to park in the Grove residential area, thereby causing considerable inconvenience to residents.

The Covid crisis has only emphasised the value of green spaces for exercise, leisure and to maintain mental health. The areas between the town and the canal, especially Marshcroft Lane, are in almost constant use by dog-walkers, cyclists and hikers. This proposal destroys much of that.

In conclusion, given the shift in government policy and the unknown long term effects of Covid on working patterns, whatever forecasts were used to produce these plans are well out of date and will produce a result which is, certainly, not in the best interests of Tring, it's residents present and future, and its environs.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10104

**Person ID** 1268045

**Full Name** C PERRY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 2,700 houses within Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10143
<b>Person ID</b>	1261270
<b>Full Name</b>	Adam Austen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	re Tr01, Tr02, Tr02, Tr04, Tr05 and Tr06.

I would like to strongly object to these on multiple grounds:

In Sections 23.139 and 23.140 you state that "Growth will need to be carefully managed to take account of existing local highway, and "Growth at Tring will also need to be sensitive in its design and landscaping. However, this is followed by a proposal of over 2,200 new houses, which is an increase of around 50% of the number of houses in the town in three relatively small areas, in addition to the new developments already under construction on Icknield Way. This will result in a far higher density of housing than there currently is, with the East of Tring area having the equivalent of around a third of Tring's housing stock crammed into a relatively small area.

Tring is a small town, with the character of one, and this is an utterly ludicrous increase in the size of the town. Although some enlargement in the size of the town and its population would be acceptable to most residents an increase of this magnitude is not.

Although the Plan talks of additional resources in terms of schools, etc, adding this number of houses to a small town will swamp its character.

Additionally, the areas at the east of Tring (New Mill, East of Tring) will be served by London Road, Cow Lane and Bulborne Road/Icknield Way for access to Tring town centre and the A41; all of these are fairly small roads and not sufficient to take the traffic of an additional 6,000 or so people. These roads will become traffic bottlenecks and none of them is suitable for enlargement.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS10164

**Person ID**

871624

**Full Name**

Mrs Erica Guy

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Dear Sir, I have very mixed feelings about this plan.  
Sixty years ago, we were very grateful to move to a new house in Tring, because we

could not afford anything in London- the houses were built on farmland here.  
 Our four sons were brought up and educated here and we have much to thank Tring  
 I do realise that, of course new affordable houses are needed and the young families of today need them just as much as we did then.  
 However 3000 houses seem far too many for a town this size and will change the character of the place.  
 I urge you to build houses that the young people can afford to buy or rent and not to flood the town with even more expensive houses, we have enough already.  
 So many more new residents will need , Schools, Doctors Hospitals , better buses and trains and more parking at the station and in the town.  
 This should all be taken into consideration BEFORE the houses are built.  
 One of my sons lives in Scotland and they built the new Secondary School there before they even started on the houses, so it can be done.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10170
<b>Person ID</b>	1268080
<b>Full Name</b>	Patrick and Lorraine McIntyre
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please accept this email as notification of our disagreement with the proposed local plan for Berkhamsted and Tring. In particular the number of houses proposed is ill-considered and unacceptable.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10186

<b>Person ID</b>	1268086
<b>Full Name</b>	NATALIE LONG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>I can accept the need for the provision of new properties, however I the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost, putting a large amount of wildlife at risk plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>I'd urge a revisiting of this proposal in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10189
<b>Person ID</b>	1207749
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Craven
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The amount of development planned at Tring and in particular the Station Road side of Tring, is excessive and inequitable when compared to other nearby Towns. The plans proposed reflect some easy and lazy planning choices that do not accurately accomodate changes to recent planning guidance form central government.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10206
<b>Person ID</b>	211450
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Glasser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a Tring resident I believe that the Dacorum Local Plan should strongly be resisted. It is ill conceived and badly thought out especially as the criteria and assumptions upon which it is based have changed significantly in the last twelve months. John Maynard Keynes famously said "when the facts change, I change my mind. What do you do, sir?" I would put the same question to Dacorum Borough Council (DBC).</p> <p>Firstly, the Government has decided that major housing development should be switched from the South of England to the North of England.</p> <p>Secondly, Covid-19 and Brexit, according to the Office of National Statistics (ONS), have both already had a significant impact on the population growth of England. The former has caused the birth rate to drop and the latter has resulted in net emigration of approximately 1 million people. Clearly the overall requirement needs to be reassessed.</p> <p>Even if this was not the case the planned growth for Tring is grossly excessive. In the natural scheme of things some growth would be expected but certainly not on the scale indicated by the plan. The plan suggests growth of approximately 50% in the allocated period. This would change and diminish the very nature of the town as would some details of the infrastructure that have been recommended eg a supermarket in Brook Street and also closure of the Tring Town Museum.</p>

DBC currently has major problem maintaining the sustainability of the area eg lack of appropriate jobs has resulted in the need for seven food banks in the borough. The number of acute hospital beds available to the population is one of the worst in England, indeed worse than in some developing countries. There is nothing in the plan that suggests that DCB would do any better with the envisaged population growth. I could go on ad nauseum.

Stop now and rethink the plan. Start with some down to top consultation. Ask the young what they want. Take note of what John Maynard Keynes said. If you do the residents of DBC, especially of Tring, will thank you.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10211

**Person ID** 1264673

**Full Name** Tara Thirkettle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to build thousands of home on the edge of Long Marston. Long Marston already suffers from flooding and the proposed site for development also suffers from flooding. Any development in this area will only exacerbate the problem.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10302

**Person ID** 1268261

**Full Name** JANET LANE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my horror at the plans to build so many more houses in and around Northchurch, Berkhamsted and Tring. It's planning gone mad, you refuse planning for one small dwelling for my elderly parents in my green belt garden but find it acceptable to build thousands of houses on local green belt land. Does that mean my planning application is acceptable now?</p> <p>New Road Northchurch can't cope with the traffic on it now as it's used as a rat run from the A5 and there have been four accidents on the sharp bend in as many weeks. When you have a narrow country road that has to funnel over a single lane canal bridge leading into the frontage of a primary/ junior school close to the junction to the High Street it seems senseless to make matters worse by adding further housing into the mix, therefore more cars. It's all about money for someone but not the local residents.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a small market town in the bottom of a valley whose geography alone doesn't lend itself to adding more housing. The infrastructure to support that just isn't in place nor is there any place to improve it.</p> <p>Tring is similar.</p> <p>I can only object to the mindlessness of it all in the strongest possible terms.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10350
<b>Person ID</b>	1268422
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLYN PANKIW
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	With reference to the above consultation. I have not been able to get on to any of the links given to view the consultation, however, I would like to register my objections to the plans for approx. 3000 houses to be built between Long Marston,

Wingrave and Cheddington. The plan is totally inappropriate for the whole area. There is limited access to the site as all roads come through three small villages and other infrastructure is non-existent. There is an ongoing problem with flooding in Long Marston, as well as many of the fields around here.

I do not understand how plans can be made when the land is owned by several different private owners and it is definitely not a major infrastructure project!!!!!!

I do not live in Hertfordshire but on the edge (in Buckinghamshire) of the proposed project. Why is it that the consultation has been given such a limited time when the vast majority of the local population were not even made aware of them, especially those in Buckinghamshire who would be severely impacted by the plans. You cannot view the plans in the local library – these have been shut for many months, and as stated previously the links given to view the plans are unattainable.

I am in disbelief that an area such as this could even be considered for such large scale building,

I look forward to receiving your comments although, being slightly sceptical, I would doubt that I will even get an acknowledgement.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10360

**Person ID** 1268427

**Full Name** GRAHAM HAYNES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** **Tring Homes** An addition of 2,730 new homes is disproportionate and will be detrimental to the character of the market town.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10367
<b>Person ID</b>	1268429
<b>Full Name</b>	MR & MRS K WRIGHT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are emailing to express our concern for the proposed development in and around the Berkhamsted and Tring area. Our family has lived in Berkhamsted since the 1800s. Personally we have lived here for nearly 70 years and we have grandchildren and siblings living in Tring. We love this area and feel so blessed to live here. However, we are becoming increasingly concerned about the over development of this area. One of the many blessings of living here has been the green belt land that surrounds us – an area we believed would never be built on.</p> <p>We are concerned that building contracts will be given to developers wanting to make as much money as they can from building expensive houses in this prime location. We understand that some starter homes are planned to be built but is there any provision for houses with small gardens (not flats or apartments) that older, local residents could buy thus freeing up more family homes? As we get older we do not want to be forced to move out of this area, and away from our grandchildren and support network, when the time comes for us to downsize.</p> <p>We are concerned that over development will not be supported by improvement in the infrastructure. During normal times it only takes one car to be parked or broken down in the wrong place for the whole town to become gridlocked, especially during rush hour. It is the same if the bypass is closed for some reason.</p> <p>We understand that it is necessary to provide housing for the growing population. However, we are concerned that the plans are just ticking boxes to fulfil requirements dictated from the government rather than addressing local needs.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10369
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The small market town of Tring is expected to absorb what is a 20% increase in residents, bolting a new “village” onto it.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10401
<b>Person ID</b>	1264613
<b>Full Name</b>	Susan Kane
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I object to the plans to increase the plan to increase the size of Decorum housing by such a large number of houses, in particular Tring increaseing the number of housing by 55% taking up much needed farm land and where are this number of people going to work? There is not enough Doctors or schools ect for this number of people.  I do appreciate that more housing is needed but it should not increase by this percentage in any area.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10410
<b>Person ID</b>	493957

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I travel to visit friends in Tring and shop sometimes there, it is important to point out the catastrophic affect the proposed 2730 new dwellings is @50% increase in population which a small market town like Tring will be unable to absorb and retain its current charm.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10415
<b>Person ID</b>	1268436
<b>Full Name</b>	LUKE PICKETT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I'm writing with regards to the housing development planned for Tring. This is going to be a fairly in-depth email, so you may want to brace yourself. But there is a lot that needs to be said.</p> <p>I have to say, I'm extremely concerned by the plans, and the sheer scale of what is being proposed. It seems such a huge transformation, that will make Tring almost unrecognisable. I fear not much thought/concern has gone towards the reality of this vision, and the detrimental effect it will have on the people who already populate Tring, but also it's beautiful, green belt surroundings. I hate to say it but, (from the outside looking in) this seems to look a lot more about making property developers even more money.</p>

Land is given green belt status for a reason, and there just seems to be a complete disregard for this. Such a huge upscale in population increase needs a much more realistic outlook. There simply aren't the amenities here. It's a shame these discussions never seem to take place within the communities they're happening in. There would probably be more compromise and easier solutions, as the community would actually feel like it's being listened to, and respected.

I understand that "affordable" housing being developed is something that is necessary. What I'm not happy with is the scale in which it's happening. You are planning on building on areas of outstanding, natural beauty. I walk my dog on these lands everyday, as I know many people do. Communities need places like this for escapism, and their mental health. I'm afraid asking the entirety of Tring to go and take a walk at the park isn't going to cut it. In building on these lands, not only are you depriving the people of Tring places to exercise and be human beings, you are also destroying homes for various wildlife, increasing the risk of flooding, and putting more strain on our already delicate planet.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10462

**Person ID** 1268450

**Full Name** JOSEPH STOPPS

**Organisation Details** DACORUM GREEN PARTY

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Tring will see a 55% increase in houses which will be built almost entirely on green belt land. The character of the local town will be changed forever. Inadequate thought to the pressures on water supplies, water waste, traffic needs, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements) have been made. It seems a huge number of houses will simply be added to the town. We are particularly concerned with the developments being proposed on the East of Tring which seem to have poor connectivity to the town.

Issues specific to Tring include:

- The High Street is very narrow and at points dangerous to pedestrians and cannot accommodate double the amount of traffic. Air quality on the High Street is also very poor with schools close by.
- With the loss of local business hubs such as Akeman Business Park there is a lack of local business space in the town centre to accommodate a doubling in size of the local

- Tring has no recycling centre and already desperately requires one. Fly tipping is increasing due to lack of local facilities.
- Tring Station has poor public transport connectivity and inadequate parking. Buses are infrequent, unreliable, expensive and only operate during certain times. Cycle paths are poorly maintained and dangerous with cars given priority. Sustainable connectivity to the station would need to be greatly improved to accommodate a doubling of the town's size and should be in the Local Plan.
  - Tring has lost all its banks and other valuable local amenities, many of which have been converted to residential properties, already the local post office is struggling to cope with
- Tring will lose a huge amount of its valuable green belt. We call for every acre of green belt which is developed a further two acres is rewilded with public access. Such rewilded sites must be protected for future generations and located within easy access of the new

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10472

**Person ID** 1268453

**Full Name** ROSEMARY ROUSE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I have read the booklet on the above plan and wish to make the following comments.

I have lived in Tring for over 40 years and have watched the town grow in a pleasant way. The advent of the bypass improved the centre of our town with its narrow High Street. Even with most of the lorries diverting along the bypass, the High Street still struggles with traffic coming through. Now I see this horrendous plan to increase our population by 50% and fear for our friendly town.

Tring is a town of 13,000/14,000 residents in an area of outstanding natural beauty and you are proposing 2731 new houses to overload our local facilities. Have you taken a detailed walk down Tring High Street to see the facilities we have to offer?

Crucially we have no bank and only a tiny post office. Not everyone has a computer to do online banking, or wishes to and the post office would struggle to cope with more residents. We have 2 supermarkets which do serve the present population well; 2 excellent hardware shops, too many hairdressers and coffee shops and estate agents alongside other small individual shops, which are very important.

The High Street cannot be extended, neither should it be, as the character of the town would be spoilt.

You quote “The creation of healthy communities is essential in delivering our vision for Dacorum. Any growth needs to be supported by the appropriate community services and facilities.”

To increase the population by 50% we would need a new community hall and a new doctor’s surgery. The surgery is already struggling to cope with the present population without including the new residents of the 250 houses currently being built on LA5 and there was no provision for doctor’s surgery in that plan either. Where are they on the plan?

You say you do not directly provide healthcare. We vote you [ the councillors] to protect and improve the environment where we live and that must surely include healthcare and community buildings. Even if you do not provide them you must have a vision of where they would go on the plan and there is no mention of either.

Taking land out of the Green Belt to build 2731 new homes on top of what is already being built to the west of Tring is not “exceptional circumstances” and the present infrastructure will not be able to support it. You are taking away more of our green spaces which are vital to our wellbeing, as the last year has proved, and replacing it with more houses and more cars and pollution.

At a time when we are being encouraged to buy local food to cut down road miles and as a country to become more self-sufficient, post Brexit, why are you considering Dunsley Farm as an area to build houses. Where is that farm being relocated to?

The local museum, part of the history of Tring, which your report says is vital to preserve and is supported by many volunteers and the History Society for the people of Tring and the many visitors who come to our town, must be preserved and left in the centre of the town.

Why should our contribution to this housing dilemma be the next largest after Hemel Hempstead? We have a smaller population than Berkhamsted and far fewer facilities and yet our housing share is greater. Where are all these new home buyers coming from and where are they going to work?

Why are Dacorum still basing the housing needs on the ONS of 2014, when there has been another ONS survey since which has reduced the housing needs from the previous figure,

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10492

**Person ID** 869129

**Full Name** Ms Ann Hetherington



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10509
<b>Person ID</b>	1268608
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW CLARKE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the "Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038) plan" and in particular the ludicrous plans to so dramatically increase the housing stock in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>Both towns already suffer from insufficient capacity in the following to service the existing populations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctors</li> <li>• Hospitals</li> <li>• Policing</li> </ul>

- Parking n town centres
- Schools
- Sports facilities
- Transport links into London
- Parking at Berkhamsted railway station
- Supermarkets
- Restaurants and pubs

Neither town has the capacity to deal with further traffic in what are already overcrowded roads that were built for a time before the motor car.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10525

**Person ID** 1268615

**Full Name** LOUISE ABSLOM

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

- 1 The proposed increase in housing numbers (over 2700) are not justifiable for Tring.
- 2 Green Belt land has been given up far too readily for development, instead of using supportable evidence to push back on the government.
- 3 The plan is not nearly explicit or proactive enough in improving the local natural environment, is not distinctive and, in general, lacks vision for the future of Tring.

I recognise that Dacorum has significant challenges to address in the Local Plan. However, I have a number of very serious concerns about what is proposed.

However, there are significant gaps, errors, flawed assumptions and also inconsistencies with stated objectives. The proposed increase in housing for Tring is far in excess of national guidelines for 'sustainable development' and assurances

that this will not have a negative impact are both vague and lacking in vision. The Plan fails to set out explicit and proactive measures to mitigate the loss of Green Belt and to actively improve the environment. It also fails to define standards that are ambitious or definitive enough to shape developments appropriate for how we will live and work in the mid-21st century. In contradiction to its own stated goals, it neither defines or attempts to build upon what is distinctive about Tring and its surroundings and appears to acquiesce to classic developer-led motivations for unambitious, clone-like projects.

The overarching goals of the Local Plan cannot be achieved by small incremental changes to how development has occurred in Dacorum over the last 50 years. Meeting the latest national and Hertfordshire position on environmental sustainability, wildlife corridors and green spaces alone will require specific, planned and proactive interventions. These are lacking in the Plan as it stands. And all new developments should be held to the highest possible standards for energy efficient construction and use. Again, the Plan ‘lacks teeth’ in this regard.

The following is a summary of my key concerns:

- 1 A very high percentage of expansion at Tring is proposed to be on Green Belt land and there is a strong case that any developments on former Green Belt land should be held to the highest possible environmentally friendly, sustainability and energy efficiency standards. Explicit provision should be made for this – if we want distinctive, exemplar development this must be mandated. In addition, the NPPF also calls for ‘for compensatory improvements to be made to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land’ and this must also be explicit with minimum 10% net gain. This is not at present explicitly addressed and is a significant point of non-compliance.
- 1 The proposed growth of over 2700 new homes is not compliant with the heart of NPPF guidance for ‘sustainable development’. It is proportionately by far the largest urban growth across Dacorum in a location that is arguably least well suited for it. It is significantly above the evidence-based proportion for Tring based on population growth through the Plan period as amended by the Government’s ‘affordability’ formula (evidenced in the September 2020 SW Herts Local Housing document).

Even if the numbers decrease significantly after recently announced Government changes there is no information in the Plan about prioritisation for reduced numbers (this needs to be made public) and it is likely the essence of the plan will remain much the same. Therefore, the following concerns remain valid:

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS10529
<b>Person ID</b>	1268615
<b>Full Name</b>	LOUISE ABSLOM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Public transport goals are aspirational only and there is nothing in the Plan that convincingly addresses transport between Tring Station and the town centre or around the new developments, or which supports modern, novel solutions.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10531
<b>Person ID</b>	1268615
<b>Full Name</b>	LOUISE ABSLOM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Tring is flanked on two sides by Buckinghamshire and traffic, town centre use, schooling and employment patterns are influenced very strongly by this. There is no reference to liaison with Bucks in the plan. We are concerned that conclusions about the locations of employment, retail and recreational sites are flawed in places and generally sub-optimised as a result. The same is also true when looking at environmental considerations.

1 A key and important goal, first built into the Issues and Options (2017) Plan, is for the Local Plan and developments to reflect local distinctiveness. There is no evidence that Tring's distinctive character (in its history, town economy, unique location, etc.) has been defined, and there is therefore no associated vision; this presents an unacceptably high risk of generic, unsympathetic development.

The Plan, for reasons that are not clear, conveys a message that growth far in excess of that necessary, along with the significant loss of Green Belt, is a fait accompli. This is in stark contrast to previous versions of the Plan and is not aligned with the clear wishes of the vast majority of the Borough's population.

The real reasons for the excessively high housing growth numbers in the Plan are not explicit – especially for Tring where the relative increase in almost three times higher than the next most impacted town (and this in an area which, even according to presented evidence, is least well suited to such an increase in terms of adverse impact on the environment).

The proposed numbers are already in excess of that required by the Government.

Overall, the irreparable damage that will be done to the Green Belt and the surrounding area of Tring and beyond are antiquated and not in line with building a sustainable and green future for my children.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10541

**Person ID** 1268671

**Full Name** Mr Mike Jennings

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The delivery strategies are inappropriate because the premise of the housing need / development growth is not sustainable and lacks justification because the council has over estimated the requirement for growth, exceeding the Governments

requirements. Dacorum is a Borough with a large area identified as of environmental importance. The present demands on the environment are causing a deterioration in the environment. Hence the proposed growth will further damage the environment, especially around Tring and Berkhamsted. Mitigation measures are required that will result in Net Environmental Gain NEG (as identified in the NPPF). A high quality environment surrounds these towns, albeit deteriorating due to current recreational pressures. Sufficient measures to provide NEG are not feasible within the local environment. Offsetting the impacts elsewhere will not compensate for the impacts on the local environment. This will inevitably lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the SAC, SSSI's and local areas of importance to biodiversity.

These adverse impacts do not comply with the local policies and national legislation.

Delivery strategies in the plan need to take into account the latest information with respect to carbon, nitrogen and nutrient neutrality issues (In Practice December 2020, Page 6 Nutrient neutrality; Air pollution Pages 7-10; Nitrogen pollution Pages 11 - 14). The reference provided has other articles that are also relevant in the context of all local plans.

Current levels of mitigation (e.g. linear park Tr03) may marginally reduce adverse impacts but does not begin to mitigate for the impacts on the wider area. The plan continues a long tradition of underestimating adverse impacts from human pressure and over-estimating the benefits of developer-led growth.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10570
<b>Person ID</b>	1164729
<b>Full Name</b>	David Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS10604

**Person ID**

1268727

**Full Name**

MR & MRS DW AND EA BELLIN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We strongly object to the above Plan on the following grounds:

1. The Proposal is to increase the amount of housing in Tring by 2,700 houses, a 55% increase. Further, with reference to Page 16 "Key Developments in Tring" of the Dacorum Local Plan booklet distributed to households, it looks like the footprint of the Town is nearly to double. No Town could absorb this degree of expansion and still retain its character or for its Services to be able to cope with the extra demand that that extra housing places upon it.

2. Looking at the Maps of the 'Satellite Towns' to Hemel Hempstead - Berkhamsted, Tring, Kings Langley, Bovingdon, and Markyate, it is evident that Tring is the only one with this degree of unacceptable expansion.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10625

**Person ID** 1268732

**Full Name** KATRINA BECKWITH

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

raise no objection to the delivery strategy for Hemel Hempstead, which accords with the recommended delivery strategy raised in previous consultation.

However, objection is raised in full to proposed Policies SP23, SP24 and SP25. As raised in response to other policies, above, the proposed housing delivery requirement for Tring of 2.731 cannot be justified and requires complete review.

There has been a failure in evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for a housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tro2 and Tro3. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt

land for housing. The Council have failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness Green

Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such

substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss in balance and as such the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to



draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10662

**Person ID** 1268741

**Full Name** BRIAN WHITEHEAD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Housing - Actual achievement of affordable housing would e a good thing. At the moment developers merely give lip service to this ideal. The Council needs to re-establish its council housing base.

Employment - There is little in Tring itself leading to wholesale commuting to the major towns around.

Retail - Tring Town Centre will need support following the pandemic.

Sustainability - car use will always be essential to Tring residents as local public transport is unsustainable and subsidies increasingly difficult to find. The hilly nature of the terrain is a disincentive to the older population to cycle.

Environment and Countryside - The Chilterns are an area deserving of special protection and the unnecessary seizing of 'protected' open space should be avoided.

Health - Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted deserve proper hospital facilities and should not be dependant on Watford General. At the same time there should be better recognition that Tring and district is best served from Stoke Mandeville Hospital.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10746

**Person ID** 1145586

**Full Name** Miss Hannah Moynehan

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p> <p>[PLEASE SEE ATTACHED IMAGE OF TRING SETTLEMENT]</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Tring image.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10769
<b>Person ID</b>	1268759

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Catherine Rudin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring is totally out of proportion especially when compared to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. The proportion of growth allocated to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth. I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would irreversibly damage and harm the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10776
<b>Person ID</b>	1268761
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Colvin

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have resided in Tring for 25 years and have seen sufficient development in what is classed as "ANOB" already that has abused this classification. My comments relate to all the Tring proposed developments. This is already an overcrowded area, with support infrastructures that are not able to cope. This includes sewage, town parking, services, waste collection, social, medical, station parking among others..</p> <p>Should new a school be developed as proposed it will ultimately be a separate unintegrated aspect of Tring and the ethos of a Market Town.</p> <p>What is the point of having ANOB that in in effect being ignored when looking at possible developments.</p> <p>Tring is a Market Town, and needs to remain as such. The Tesco store development is already a stage too far</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10782
<b>Person ID</b>	1268762
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Natalie Hill
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10791

**Person ID** 1268763

**Full Name** Mr Michael Hill

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10921

**Person ID** 1153827

**Full Name** Duncan Eggar

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I have briefly reviewed the above consultation document and have two comments:

1 The proposals for Tring will radically change the nature of the town. Recent developments are already significantly distant from the centre; what is proposed will be even further away. If Tring is to remain a cohesive community, development will have to be carried out with great sensitivity over a long period. It would be worthwhile to set up a development authority that is above party politics, has a time horizon beyond the next election and can work to well formulated strategic objectives.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10937

**Person ID** 1268871

**Full Name** Ms Karla Hatrick

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I've been trying to recover my password in order to make a comment on the strategic plan, but though the website says it has sent me a link to reset my password, I have still not received a reset email. I cannot print off the pdf consultation document either so have no other way to reply other than a direct email.

May I therefore submit some comments in this email?

We recently heard- last week-of the inclusion of Long Marston as a potential site for 3,000 houses, as part of Dacorum's strategic plan. I realise that it is one of many options, but the fact that it is proposed at all, is extraordinary.

Long Marston's name means Long Marsh, we are a wet, rural area with increasing flood problems, and wet habitat offering unique spaces for rare and protected species e.g. black poplars and greater crested newts. The village flooded several times in the last months. Our roads are too narrow for even 2 cars to pass, in many places. We have a conservation area and listed buildings. Yet of all the places to suggest new houses, we are a potential site? I believe strongly in local democracy, but I wonder then if anyone from Dacorum who has been involved in writing the report has visited the site

in question, or spoken to residents, and would perhaps like to do so after wet weather. We certainly, as a village, have had no notification of the potential for building, no discussion, no consultation.

So if you're looking to build houses on a flood plain, to increase flooding for others in the village, and to build houses which will become uninsurable when they too flood, on small narrow roads with potholes far from any major road network, where community cohesion will be ripped apart as all locals who know of the plans object, where rare local species will be negatively affected, green sites destroyed, conservation areas made pointless, then what a great choice. This kind of proposal is precisely what makes people lose faith in the competence of local decision making.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10985

**Person ID** 1162376

**Full Name** Jade Holmes

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.



The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10996
<b>Person ID</b>	1268904
<b>Full Name</b>	NICOLA MAGUIRE & MARK BONAR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	* <b>Tring and Northchurch</b> will be completely overwhelmed - Tring (old small market town) with a housing quota which would increase it's population by more than half - 55% and Northchurch a village, which in the plan is being referred to as West Berkhamsted. Tring and Northchurch will be changes beyond recognition at a cost of losing their present and historical identities as small rural communities
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11009
<b>Person ID</b>	333882

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Mark Barfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I strongly object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of houses within Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS11018
<b>Person ID</b>	1268908
<b>Full Name</b>	Molly Berry
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The development in Tring will fundamentally change the town, doubling the number of residents in this small market town, so extreme care is needed to maintain the quality of life for those in the area.</p> <p>Upgrades of sewers and sewage treatment works in Tring are needed before any building takes place, and flood management has to be part of the plan, as we know we will get many more extreme rain events in a warmer world. I'm sure you wouldn't want to be responsible for existing homes being flooded, or for having raw sewage in local watercourses.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11037
<b>Person ID</b>	871314
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Ron Schafer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	This response relates to TR01,02,03,06 and Tring and Dacorum in general.

The proposal to load Tring with a massive burden of new housing contradicts all the fine words about sustainability, environment and quality of life and so on. There are no benefits to existing Tring residents of development on this scale. All Tring can hope for is some mitigation of the damage done.

Since the plan contains no constructive proposals of any clarity the main purpose of the plan seems to be to find a way of implementing arbitrary and excessive housing targets that have been derived by questionable assumptions and algorithms from central government. To suggest that this new housing is to meet local need is palpably absurd. Any such need should have been met by hundreds of 'beautiful' houses already under construction.

These targets have been imposed by the government under threat of having such development simply imposed if no plan is forthcoming. This negates the opportunity for a genuine plan to improve life here and leaves electors disenfranchised and alienated. The resources would be better applied to tackle unemployment and social deprivation where it exists and improve quality of life rather than reduce it.

The proposal is reminiscent of the unsuccessful imposition of the GLC estate in the 1970s and the construction of a motorway through Tring Park. Up to now we have retained access to the countryside through the protection afforded by the green belt. This has been at the cost of the packing out of towns with additional housing, including wasteful demolition of historic and residential properties to achieve higher housing density and meet external demand and imposed planning targets. Now the council proposes to build high density housing estates on the protected green belt land leaving Tring with the worst of both worlds.

The proposed investment in housing and supporting infrastructure would be better directed at the sink estates and depressed or marginalised communities and areas of social deprivation that are sensibly supposed to be 'levelled up' under Conservative election promises.

Overall it is impossible to have any faith in the local planning process and the national policy decisions behind it.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11042

**Person ID** 1145445

**Full Name** Mr Jason McInerney

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
**\* Yes**

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11054
<b>Person ID</b>	1268912
<b>Full Name</b>	SIAN FITZPATRICK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In relation to the delivering strategy, the volume of housing proposed to be built in Tring is too high and involves the destruction of large areas of local green space. Over the past year, this area has proved invaluable to local residents as an opportunity to access quiet and open green spaces and to lose this would have a huge impact on local residents and for many lose the reason why they chose to live in Tring in the first place. There is also a disproportionate volume of development proposed in Tring with approx. 55% growth compared to approx. 20% in Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11062
<b>Person ID</b>	1268913
<b>Full Name</b>	SONIA FAIRBARN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As noted in the previous section the requirements for development are out of date. There is no understanding within the plan that the location of Tring is adjacent to the Buckinghamshire border and the large and expanding town of Aylesbury. The developments over the border are important in the context of the Dacorum local plan, especially the large provision of warehousing and employment opportunities provided by the Aylesbury expansion. Nearby development in Aylesbury is not taking place in isolation and must influence the contents within the Dacorum plan. This point is expanded upon within the Tring in Transition response.</p> <p>The delivery strategies are inappropriate because the premise of the housing need / development growth is not sustainable and lacks justification because the council has over estimated the requirement for growth, exceeding the Governments requirements. Dacorum is a Borough with a large area identified as of environmental importance. The present demands on the environment are causing a deterioration in the environment. Hence the proposed growth will further damage the environment, especially around Tring and Berkhamsted. Mitigation measures are required that will result in Net</p>

Environmental Gain NEG (as identified in the NPPF). A high quality environment surrounds these towns, albeit deteriorating due to current recreational pressures. Sufficient measures to provide NEG are not feasible within the local environment. Offsetting the impacts elsewhere will not compensate for the impacts on the local environment. This will inevitably lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the SAC, SSSI's and local areas of importance to biodiversity.

These adverse impacts do not comply with the local policies and national legislation.

Delivery strategies in the plan need to take into account the latest information with respect to carbon, nitrogen and nutrient neutrality issues (In Practice December 2020, Page 6 Nutrient neutrality; Air pollution Pages 7-10; Nitrogen pollution Pages 11 - 14). The reference provided has other articles that are also relevant in the context of all local plans.

Current levels of mitigation (e.g. linear park Tr03) may marginally reduce adverse impacts but does not begin to mitigate for the impacts on the wider area. The plan continues a long tradition of underestimating adverse impacts from human pressure and over-estimating the benefits of developer-led growth.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11072
<b>Person ID</b>	1144903
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Brian Rook
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	23.139 The DBC draft plan is lacking any proper detail concerning sustainable transport for the 21st century. 21st century infrastructure is about a zero carbon footprint, electrified transport, automated vehicles, cycle paths, and walking routes. The plan does mention that growth will be sustainable transport/accessibility and infrastructure led, but the experience of current developments based on DBC plans (Tring LA5 cannot be accessed by a cycle path and there is no cycle path from there to Tring Station) would seem to indicate that DBC are unable or unwilling to follow through on any sustainable transport commitments

Your draft infrastructure plan states Highways and Transportation  
 20.11 Tring as a settlement already has a sustainable transport infrastructure in the form of the rail and bus networks. Ensuring connectivity e.g. pedestrian/cycle links between the growth sites and existing neighbourhoods and the town centre and railways will be important in realising the most sustainable approach to transport.

It is complete nonsense to state that the current diesel bus services are sustainable. The DBC plan needs to be amended to show how you will implement properly sustainable bus services.

Your plans suggest that pedestrian and cycle path links must be in place BEFORE development in order to establish transport habits of new residents. ref. LTP 4 (2018-31). Yet your plans contain no evidence of these links, and indeed your Tring LA5 development, which is well underway, still has no evidence or plans for pedestrian and cycle path links.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11074
<b>Person ID</b>	1144903
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Brian Rook
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Ref sites TR1 to TR5</p> <p>23.136 The DBC draft plan correctly states that “Tring is an area of outstanding natural beauty”. Furthermore, your draft infrastructure plan states that...</p> <p>20.6 Key issues for the Tring include</p>



'New development could harm the setting of the Chilterns AONB, the Grand Union Canal and other interests of acknowledged importance'.

It is very clear that your proposal for the gross over-development of Tring (a 55% increase in the number of households, vehicle movements, restructured town centre) is entirely incompatible with any objective of preserving the setting of Tring and the Grand Union Canal within the Chilterns AONB, and will do irreversible harm.

Additionally all of the proposed development is located on Green Belt land, and will do irreversible harm to the Chilterns AONB by demolishing ancient trees and hedgerows, and scarring the vista of a rural green landscape with buildings covering a disproportionate acreage. The sole purpose of the Green belt legislation is to protect the rural landscape from exactly this form of over-development, yet the DBC plan is ignoring this requirement completely.

I refer you to the UK government National Planning Policy Framework (House of Commons Library):

- 'The NPPF demands that there should be "exceptional circumstances" before Green Belt boundaries can be changed and says that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should be approved only in "very special '

In your plan, you have failed to show that there is any evidence whatsoever of any "Very Special circumstances"

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11093

**Person ID** 1258923

**Full Name** Arthur Barfield

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I strongly object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of houses within Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11110
<b>Person ID</b>	1268939
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sylvia O'Brien
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11141
<b>Person ID</b>	1268957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Grylls
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

<p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>I am aware that you will have received a large number of objections to the Dacorum Local Plan, as it relates to growth in Tring. I also know that most of those objections will mirror my own, and will have been expressed by people much better informed than me. All I can do is to state below my overall objections, and in doing so add one more voice to the crowd of dismayed and disbelieving people, who cannot understand why Dacorum Borough Council has a planning strategy in mind for the next 18 years that is so fundamentally wrong.</p> <p>1 The Council for the Preservation of Rural England has made several surveys, the results showing that there are enough brownfield sites available all over the UK to provide space for expected housing growth needs of the nation for a considerable number of years. If there are not enough brownfield sites in Dacorum, then the Government should be told in no uncertain terms that the increase in housing stock it is (supposedly) requiring is just not possible in Dacorum.</p> <p>1 Greenbelt land around Tring must be kept as greenbelt land. There was a good reason for it being declared 'greenbelt' in the past. Nothing has changed in that respect.</p> <p>1 You are allowing a certain amount of space in the plan for commercial development. As a result of the current pandemic, and the uncertainties concerning economic recovery, is it at all clear what sort of businesses of what size might wish to locate themselves in Tring? There would seem to be a very large risk that 2,731 new houses (or even a much more sensible smaller number) will result in thousands more commuters.</p> <p>1 Plans for the development of the south end of Brook Street and the building of a supermarket there were debated long and hard several years ago, and sensibly rejected. It is quite wrong to reintroduce a flawed idea.</p> <p>1 A certain amount of growth in Tring is inevitable, but please do not destroy a pleasant small town by enlarging and changing it out of all recognition, in order to fulfil a plan which is ill-advised and needs to be completely re-thought out.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Tring Delivery Strategy</p>

<b>ID</b>	EGS11174
<b>Person ID</b>	1262170
<b>Full Name</b>	Julie Banks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Berkhamstead and Tring</b> , I am shocked at the outline proposals to morph this beautiful, historic towns into urban sprawl. The lost green belt will for ever change these areas of OSNB – how can the council go against government guidelines to protect our green belt and still come up with this outline plan?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11198
<b>Person ID</b>	1268982
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Yeomans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I support the submissions of the Chiltern Countryside Group (CCG) and the Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) on this question.  Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period, and given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth

to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the 5 main purposes of the Green Belt which are:

- 'to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.'

Clearly, the Green Belt in the Borough, particularly that around Tring and Berkhamsted, currently fulfils those functions. There is no justifiable cause for those essential functions to be considered unnecessary or potentially replaceable by the development of 'new green spaces' .

Further, some Green Belt sites identified for development in the LP are prime agricultural farmland, which at this time of national crisis for the nation's economy and food supplies, should hold the highest level of protection. People need homes, but more people need food. Indeed, the Green Belt land to the East of Tring (TO 2 and TO 3) marked for development is classified in the DLP Interim Sustainability Appraisal as Grade 2 agricultural land of 'best and most versatile' quality.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS11225
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11236
<b>Person ID</b>	1263717
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Wells
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Whilst appreciating the need for extra housing in the borough, I question the sheer number of dwellings that are planned. In view of the changes to employment caused by the Covid crisis, most forecasts predict that working from home will increase significantly, once the present outbreak is under control. In many respects, the Covid epidemic has only speeded up an existing trend. Additionally, the present Government has announced its intention to reinvigorate areas in the Midlands and North to increase industrial and business investment and employment opportunities in these areas.</p> <p>I suggest that , taking into account the Government’s policy of moving business out of the Home Counties and the fact that, in this age of electronic communications, distance to work ceases to be a governing factor, large numbers of people will wish to live in a much more reasonably priced area than Dacorum.</p> <p>In light of these considerations, a reassessment of the Dacorum Local Plan is urgently required.</p> <p><b>TRING</b></p> <p>I am sure that inhabitants of other towns and villages in the borough are better qualified than I to speak about their local area, but as a resident of Tring, I wish to state my objections to the current plan and to offer some suggestions as to the manner in which I think it can be improved.</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS TO CURRENT PLAN</b></p>



## Facilities

- A 55% increase in housing will alter the entire character of an historic market town. Why has the Council decided that Tring should bear the brunt of this development?
- The town's infrastructure is not capable of sustaining such a large increase in population. I note that the plan does make provision for potential new schools, but many other services are required.
- Car-parking for High Street shopping is at a premium and is one of the factors in the decline of facilities in the town centre. The Council are naïve if they believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities.
- The proposed re-development of the Fire Station and Auction area will exacerbate the car-parking problems. Even Tesco's large car-park is sometimes totally full.
- Most of the proposed housing is distant from the High Street. The surrounding roads are narrow and any further traffic will only add to the present congestion. The Council are naïve if they believe that new residents will not use cars to access shopping and leisure facilities, especially as the eastern development is distant from the town centre.
- There is a lack of local employment – most new residents are going to be commuters. It is obvious that the proposed employment facilities will be inadequate to cater for the vastly increased population.
- Car-parking at the station is also limited; indeed the Station Car-Park's own web-site states that even season-ticket holders cannot be guaranteed a parking place after 8 a.m. Many people from surrounding villages use the station and, owing to the car-parking charges, there is a growing tendency for commuters to park in the Grove residential area, thereby causing considerable inconvenience to residents.

## Environmental concerns

- The proposed housing to the east of the town is on Green Belt land. The Chilterns are an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the sheer size of the development will have a serious detrimental effect on a beautiful environment, impacting on valuable farming land.
- The Government, in addition to its policy of focusing housing in the Midlands and North, has announced that it would now be prioritising brownfield sites and urban areas - not Green Belt.
- The Covid crisis has only emphasised the value of green spaces for exercise and leisure to improve mental health. The areas between the town and the canal, especially Marshcroft Lane, are in almost constant use by dog-walkers, cyclists and hikers.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11241

**Person ID** 1262469

**Full Name** Mark Waters

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I would wish to challenge the methodology behind Dacorum's housing targets and the huge increases in planned houses in Berkhamsted and especially Tring (a 55per cent increase).

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11243

**Person ID** 1268990

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Nick de la Bedoyere
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11260
<b>Person ID</b>	1268893
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Hopping

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11288

<b>Person ID</b>	1268994
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Julie Hopping
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11353
<b>Person ID</b>	221830
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Baerbel de la Bedoyere
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS11450
<b>Person ID</b>	1264362
<b>Full Name</b>	Juliet Miller
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial</p>

developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11494

**Person ID** 865014

**Full Name** Mr Robert Turnbull

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.



The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11501

**Person ID** 1269116

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs S & J Ballantyne

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the overarching 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected across Dacorum this disproportionate development proposal is obviously just an easy win for the council because landowners happen to have offered large sites here. It is not based on any objective assessment of need and runs roughshod over legal principles related to the protection of Green Belt and AONB and sustainability.

Apart from the irreparable harm to the sites themselves, which contribute to the character and openness of the area, the proposed development on the land East of Tring has not been justified by evidence of exceptional circumstances in the Strategies (except for providing large volume development, which is disputed) and would cause irreversible harm to the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Green Belts are allocated to provide particular protections to the countryside and retain the character of historic towns like Tring (as defined in the national planning framework) and all are relevant to the sites east of Tring.

As well as being in the Green Belt these sites are also high quality agricultural land - it's just inconceivable that anyone could think that they should be priority development sites compared to others. There is no evidence in the proposed Plan that justifies such a disproportionate allocation for development outside the existing settlement boundaries of Tring on this sort of land.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11513

**Person ID** 1269117

**Full Name** ANITA PARRY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11550

**Person ID** 1269122

**Full Name** KATHRYN WHITTLE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11561
<b>Person ID</b>	1269123
<b>Full Name</b>	KENTON WHITTLE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green</p>

Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and **AONB**, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11602
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Tring</b></p> <p>Tring is a small historic market town but the character of the town will change completely with the plan for 2,274 new dwellings, of which 2250 will be on 172ha of Green Belt land! The amount of development proposed is clearly excessive and would have a devastating impact on the character of the town and its surroundings. There is no justification for this amount of development nor the amount of Green Belt loss. Only small-scale developments in the urban area of the town</p>

should be permitted so that the existing town is not subsumed by the virtual 'new town' which will increase the population of Tring by 60%!

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11625

**Person ID** 1158198

**Full Name** JACK ARMSTRONG

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11660

**Person ID** 1269152

**Full Name** SIMON RHEAD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11671

**Person ID** 1269212

**Full Name** PETER SCOTT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We welcome the commitment to genuinely affordable housing to be included in developments in Berkhamsted and Tring but believe affordable needs to be properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.

The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.

The plan must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.



To sustain an increase in population, improvements in infrastructure need to be implemented as houses are built. These are commuter towns and residents rely on transport to make journeys out of the town to travel to work. The present rail and road networks will not sustain such an increase in population.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11688

**Person ID** 1269212

**Full Name** PETER SCOTT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files** [PETER SCOTT 2.jpg](#)

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11691
<b>Person ID</b>	1269212
<b>Full Name</b>	PETER SCOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11711
<b>Person ID</b>	1269217
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Hulse

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11743

<b>Person ID</b>	1269231
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH CRAVEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The amount of development planned at Tring and in particular the Station Road side of Tring, is excessive and inequitable when compared to other nearby Towns. The plans proposed reflect some easy and lazy planning choices that do not accurately accomodate changes to recent planning guidance form central government.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11752
<b>Person ID</b>	1269233
<b>Full Name</b>	CIARA KENT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green</p>

Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11774

**Person ID** 871625

**Full Name** Mrs Clare Francis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within

Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11827

**Person ID** 350823

**Full Name** Mrs Sue Yeomans

**Organisation Details** Chairman  
Chilterns Countryside Group

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** The Delivery Strategies fail to meet the vision outlined. Release of substantial swathes of high quality Green Belt, much adjoining the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty cannot be mitigated.  
I fully endorse the response of the Chiltern Countryside Group to this question.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11850

<b>Person ID</b>	1260226
<b>Full Name</b>	Lucy Sharpe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Conclusion of the proposed plan - firstly i'm not going to sit here and say i read through the plan back to front but i read through the sections i have discussed above. I have to say that i am hugely disappointed with the lack of details. I feel that it will be an incredibly difficult for you to make any proper decision on what is being proposed. The plan is lacking a lot of gaps, holes and skims what is actually being done. Please consider that as mentioned this is very extreme and wholly unnecessary vast proposal. I do have confidence that the view on the proposal is very far from being up to the standards we would expect and that common sense will shine through
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11854
<b>Person ID</b>	1264043
<b>Full Name</b>	David Sharpe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Conclusion of the proposed plan - firstly i'm not going to sit here and say i read through the plan back to front but i read through the sections i have discussed above. I have to say that i am hugely disappointed with the lack of details. I feel that it will be an incredibly difficult for you to make any proper decision on what is being proposed. The plan is lacking a lot of gaps, holes and skims what is actually being done. Please consider that as mentioned this is very extreme and

wholly unnecessary vast proposal. I do have confidence that the view on the proposal is very far from being up to the standards we would expect and that common sense will shine through

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11881

**Person ID** 1269276

**Full Name** GILBERT GRACE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**High Street**

English High Streets are having a difficult time for traders to survive.

They need support, otherwise the online shopping from the major companies, such as Amazon will destroy High Street shopping. The pandemic has accelerated on-line shopping. Amazon uses a great deal of the country's infrastructure, but do not pay their fair share of these costs. I hope the Government and Local Authorities address this problem urgently.

Tring has a great deal of character, which needs retaining.

Some other towns have created new shopping areas, which have failed.

Shopping locally is more than buying items, it is a mental attribute in meeting known people.

I have been a great supporter of Tring, and am keen that its character is not destroyed.

From the plan, it is of too small a scale to understand the "Mixed Growth Area."

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11904



<b>Person ID</b>	1269313
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Martinek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><u>Tring delivery strategy</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 For all the reasons noted above, we object to the entire Tring delivery strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It stems from an a priori flawed approach to housing need in which constraints on building on Green Belt land have not been properly considered against the starting assumption for numbers;</li> <li>• It is proposed despite DBC not having shown that they have exhausted all other options before considering Green Belt land;</li> <li>• It is based on one of a number of options, the rationale of which is confused and insufficient, and appears to have been driven by an unexplicit motivation to secure infrastructure build;</li> <li>• It results in a massively disproportionate impact on Tring and its surroundings, which is allegedly but incorrectly presented as ‘unavoidable’ and which has not been flagged for Tring residents to properly consider.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>1 There are a large number of further specific problems with the detail of the Tring delivery strategy. These are variously flowing from the following (<u>details are set out below</u>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that assumptions and conclusions for the 2017 "Issues &amp; Options" consultation seem to have been carried over to plans that are now different and / or bigger;</li> <li>• The fact that there are proposals that are presented as reasonable, but which actually contradict the stated aims of the Emerging Strategy;</li> <li>• The fact that in many cases, DBC has attempted to offer mitigation strategies, but the mitigation is variously insufficient and based on outdated or otherwise incorrect assumptions;</li> <li>• The fact that there are too many caveats and vagueness of intent for an intended Local Plan proposing such significant impact on the character of the town and surroundings.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <b>Overall, delivery and ‘mitigation’ of a “<i>comprehensively planned new neighbourhood to the East of [Tring]</i>” cannot ‘take into account sensitive views, landscape and protected environmental land’.</b> It is not possible</li> </ol>

to reconcile construction of an entirely new neighbourhood of 2000 plus houses, with associated infrastructure with the destruction of natural, green open spaces of high quality agricultural land designated as Green Belt and affording key settings for the AONB.

1 **The Emerging Strategy does not take into account the potential for the Chilterns AONB to be designated a National Park.** In 2019 the independent Glover Landscapes Review report recommended that the Chilterns AONB be designated a National Park, thus recognising the extremely valuable benefits which the AONB already contributes to the UK and its future potential. The Chilterns are significant in affording easy access to natural, unspoilt, tranquil and green landscapes, now widely recognised as of key value to mental and physical well-being for city dwellers. To permanently destroy large swathes of Green Belt sites abutting the Chilterns AONB, as the Emerging Strategy proposes, could negatively affect the possibility of National Park status.

1 **Specifically, Tring bears the brunt of loss of Green Belt land despite its smaller size and more rural character.** The proposal sees Tring taking on  $(2274/5945) = 38\%$  of all of the Green Belt allocation, compared to  $(1876/5945) = 32\%$  for Berkhamsted, and  $(1500/5945) = 25\%$  for Hemel Hempstead.

1 **Compounding the above, the Green Belt land chosen for allocation in Tring is some of the best Green Belt land in the Borough, which according to NPPF para 134 fulfils the 5 uses of Green Belt and so should not be considered expendable.** Notable characteristics of Tring's Green Belt include the following:

- Agricultural Grade 2 land ("very good")
- Providing views to/from and a gateway into the Chilterns AONB
- Providing a soft setting for the Grand Union Canal
- Providing a soft setting for Pendley Manor
- Ancient hedgerows (some over 600 years old)
- Important wildlife corridors & nature sites, such as Cow Lane Farm
- Historic features such as Marshcroft Lane (a Roman road) and its listed canal bridge

These fulfil the 5 uses of Green Belt as set out by NPPF paragraph 134 and cannot be considered 'scrappy' or expendable in terms of Green Belt function.

1 **The quality and function of this Green Belt land around Tring was partly accepted within the Green Belt Review that forms part of DBC's Evidence Base, but this evidence then appears to have been disregarded during the formation of an allocation strategy.** It appears that land has been chosen mainly for the convenience of meeting housing targets, rather than consideration of the harm that such allocation would cause. Such a strategy would fail examination under NPPF paragraph 137: "*Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced*".

- 1 **Allocation of this land would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site and also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their ‘openness and sense of permanence’ in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with NPPF paragraph 136.**

### **Size of sites**

- 1 **There is an assumption that larger parcels of developments are needed, which DBC attempts to justify through circular and flawed logic:**
  - It seems possible that this assumption is led, as noted above, by a desire to secure amenities that would not in fact otherwise be needed (i.e. a secondary school). 23.147 states that the scale of the strategic sites “*offers benefits for infrastructure co-ordination and delivery, enabling a fuller range of site and town-wide infrastructure needs to be considered and planned for that would otherwise not be possible, especially the need for two 2FE primary schools, a 6FE secondary school and significant levels of formal and informal open space.*” This is circular logic;
  - The Emerging Strategy appears locked into the thinking that strategic facilities can only be delivered to very large scale sites. This is an assertion that has not been proven through a consideration of what else would be possible on smaller sites.

### **Densification**

- 1 **Section 5.5 of the Emerging Strategy asserts that an urban densification strategy would detract from the character of Tring (and Berkhamsted), but no evidence was provided for this claim:**
  - There has been no evidenced position provided by DBC to justify a different approach to the intensification of sites within Tring in comparison to Hemel Hempstead;
  - No assessments have been undertaken to assess the opportunities to intensify development within the existing settlement of Tring through redevelopment of brownfield sites, or by way of consideration of increasing density of available sites;
  - Irrespective of the eventual housing supply requirement, there is a requirement to establish the opportunities within the existing settlement boundaries before land outside of it is considered. The same approach to assessment is required within Tring as was undertaken in Hemel Hempstead.
  
- 1 **The Emerging Strategy proposes an alternative to urban densification – “*mainly through expansions in a way that manages landscape and Green Belt impacts*” – which it then fails to deliver.** The impacts will not be managed based on the proposed mitigation strategies (see further below), and as set out above, do not need to happen in the first place.

### **Green Spaces**

- 1 **The proposals would ruin green spaces around Tring widely used for walking, cycling, riding, dog-walking, running, and including a good network of well-used public rights of way which provide access, instead offering an artificially contrived, man-made green space.** These latter spaces would be appropriate in an urban

setting, but Tring, Berkhamsted and the villages would lose the quality of green countryside and access which they already enjoy.

- 1 **There is confusion throughout between green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors; and wildlife corridors and their linkages are not explicitly mapped out as required by NPPF paragraph 174.**
  
- 1 **The Emerging Strategy fails to offer any measures which would alleviate or offer alternatives to diminish, or at least contain, the pressures on Tring Park, Tring Reservoirs, the Grand Union Canal and Ashridge which the SA identifies (B1.4):**
  - The SA notes that “[a]s urban population increases, pressures on access to countryside and these key attractions will increase”. Increasing housing in the Borough by nearly 20,000 over the next 18 years will serve only to increase pressure on these key natural resources which cannot be offset by a green play area or open space surrounded by high density housing;
  - The SA notes that (p46) *‘[the Council] considers the allocation of 1,400 homes at East of Tring will enable significant amounts of public open space to be provided, including a new public park of around 20 hectares on land classified as Grade 2. The Council considers that these requirements mitigate the impact that development would have on this particular objective.’* Twenty hectares is less than one sixth the area of the existing Tring Park, which the SA already reports to be suffering from ‘visitor pressures’. The provision of 20 hectares of public park is wholly inadequate, especially coupled with the complete lack of further mitigating action for developing on Green Belt land and the absence of any joined-up plan for linking other green spaces impacted by the proposed developments.
  
- 1 **The NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces, but there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around Tring.** This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key attractive and popular green spaces of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.

#### Highways network

- 1 **Options for both road connections and sustainable travel have NOT been adequately explored despite the fact that the SA page 43 notes that DBC’s considerations include ‘*minimising, where possible, adverse impacts on the highway network and seeking to maximise opportunities for supporting sustainable modes of travel*’.** In particular for a TR03/TR02, north–south road, connectivity has not been considered beyond vague notions that something will be required. This is nowhere near concrete enough.

#### Traffic and transport

1 **The delivery strategy will not be able to deliver on its aim of “walkable neighbourhoods”.** The *midpoints* of the new neighbourhoods planned for the East of Tring are 1 mile from the town centre. This is the limit of the 20 minute “walkability” threshold for fit adults, and beyond the threshold for elderly people, parents with buggies, or those who are carrying shopping. Under these circumstances, it is hard to see how policy SP24 can deliver on its aim of “walkable neighbourhoods”.

1 **Thousands of new houses mean thousands more cars in the town, and the distances mentioned above will inevitably lead to higher car dependency in the new neighbourhoods. This will mean more traffic to and from the town centre: more congestion, more noise, more pollution, and higher CO2 emissions. The proposed mitigation is vague or faulty:**

- Mention at 152 of "one or two congestion points" is misleading; the solution seems to be creating an "East Tring Bypass" via Marshcroft Lane. These congestion points mainly affect TR02/03, the least walkable new neighbourhoods;
- At 23.154 there is mention of an East-West cycle way but with no proposed route;
- At 23.156 there is a mention that a new north-south road "could help congestion" – but this is a vague aspiration, with no plan, no route, no analysis (contrary to NPPF paragraph 108c which requires these);
- Traffic would be exacerbated by any plans to build a new supermarket.

1 **The Emerging Strategy fails to acknowledge existing parking problems and so proposals for mitigation are inadequate:**

- Increased traffic will inevitably lead to increased need for parking, both in the town centre and at the train station. The town already had problems with provision of parking;
- A new cycle path from Pitstone to Tring Station might encourage a ‘modal shift’ for commuters from Pitstone and join up with the existing facility on Westfield Road, but this is unlikely to offset demand created elsewhere;
- Tring Station carpark is often already full, with commuters driving further to Berkhamsted.

1 **In non-pandemic times rail capacity at Tring is oversubscribed. There should be joined up plans for increasing rail capacity as a prerequisite for any development.** Working patterns may change with COVID and working from home, but these unknowns do not provide a sound basis on which to make such a radical plan.

### **Loss of Character**

1 **Despite claiming to want to “*promote the distinctiveness of each of Dacorum’s towns and villages, reinforcing their role and character*” the Tring delivery strategy is likely to result in a number of harms, such as (further details in site specific comments below):**

- Industrial buildings on London Road detracting from the entrance to Tring, which is currently seen as attractive;
- A new supermarket in the town centre damaging our ‘Old English’ look and feel;

- More car dependent neighbourhood's will erode the town's "go by foot" feeling, and impact the passing trade of our distinctive shops;
- More distant neighbourhoods risk eroding our sense of community, and creating "them and us" feelings;
- More traffic on the High Street might discourage our tradition of parades and festivals (Summer Carnival; Christmas Festival);
- A distinct loss of heritage (further details below) through the 'translocation' of Tring Museum, the loss of Tring Marketplace, harm to Marshcroft Lane and harm to Jeacock's Orchard.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12006

**Person ID** 1269353

**Full Name** TESSA BARFIELD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I strongly object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of houses within Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12026

**Person ID** 1146050

**Full Name** Mr Alastair Macdonald

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

These comments pertain to the expansion of Tring by 55%:

The Government's own National Planning Policy Framework (2019) cites that:

"The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in preparing the development plan, and is a material consideration in planning decisions."

The proposed development for Tring does not meet with the Policy Framework in the following areas, and makes no provision to mitigate or reduce the affect upon said areas:

"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- 1 a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
- 2 b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
- 3 c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
- 4 d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- 5 e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and
- 6 f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate."

Tring is surrounded by the Chilterns AONB, which under the NPPF should be treated as follows:

"Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12076
<b>Person ID</b>	1269372
<b>Full Name</b>	MATTHEW SPEED
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12101
<b>Person ID</b>	1145854
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Deborah Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p> <p>The allocation of Tr06 would cause substantial harm to the historic town centre.</p>

<b>Included files</b>																			
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy																		
<b>ID</b>	EGS12113																		
<b>Person ID</b>	1269413																		
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Wallis																		
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Hon. Director of Development Tring Sports Forum																		
<b>Agent ID</b>																			
<b>Agent Full Name</b>																			
<b>Agent Organisation</b>																			
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No																			
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring Sports Forum was formed in 2005 by the then Mayor of Tring Town Council, Mike James and a few members of various sports organisations in Tring. TSF's aims were then and are now to promote improved and extra sports and leisure facilities for all of the local population, sports clubs and other organisations, who it continues to represent. In 2010 TSF joined forces with The Ilex Trust, a registered charity providing coaching and support for youngsters in a variety of sports. The new umbrella charity was and is named Tring Community Sports Trust, though TSF still trades under its original name.</p> <p>TSF has recently carried out a survey of all of its current 22 member organisations; so far 18 have reiterated that they continue to support TSF in its representations to DBC regarding the Emerging Local Plan. One club, namely Tring Tornadoes, has come back to us saying that it does not wish to be represented by TSF, but has submitted its own representations. Some other Clubs will make their own submissions in addition. Organisations that have positively fed back to us in the past couple of weeks are:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Tring Athletic Football Club</td> <td>Tring Rugby Union Football Club</td> <td>Tring Squash Club</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pendley Sports Ltd</td> <td>Tring Park Cricket Club</td> <td>Tring Beavers</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tring Beavers Swimming Club</td> <td>Tring Swimming Club</td> <td>Tring Anglers</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tring Hockey Club</td> <td>Tring Running Club</td> <td>Tring Bowls Club</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tring Martial Arts</td> <td>Tring Tennis Club</td> <td>Tring Canoe Club</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tring School</td> <td>Tring Sports Centre</td> <td>Tring Town Council</td> </tr> </table>	Tring Athletic Football Club	Tring Rugby Union Football Club	Tring Squash Club	Pendley Sports Ltd	Tring Park Cricket Club	Tring Beavers	Tring Beavers Swimming Club	Tring Swimming Club	Tring Anglers	Tring Hockey Club	Tring Running Club	Tring Bowls Club	Tring Martial Arts	Tring Tennis Club	Tring Canoe Club	Tring School	Tring Sports Centre	Tring Town Council
Tring Athletic Football Club	Tring Rugby Union Football Club	Tring Squash Club																	
Pendley Sports Ltd	Tring Park Cricket Club	Tring Beavers																	
Tring Beavers Swimming Club	Tring Swimming Club	Tring Anglers																	
Tring Hockey Club	Tring Running Club	Tring Bowls Club																	
Tring Martial Arts	Tring Tennis Club	Tring Canoe Club																	
Tring School	Tring Sports Centre	Tring Town Council																	

So far, we have yet to hear from:

Tring Corinthians Football Club Tring Town Football Club

Tring Table Tennis Club

This report has been prepared by:

Chris Wallis, Hon. Director of Development, TSF,

(contact details removed)

and

Howard Lambie, Hon Secretary & Professional Advisor to TSF,

Accordingly, we request that DBC consider TSF to be the main representative body of Tring sports clubs etc., as opposed to DSN, who represent such organisations throughout the Borough. In separate Emails following this submission, we shall be seeking consultations with DBC Planning Officers, as well as further meetings with HCC and TTC to discuss the siting and amount of land to be given-over to sports and leisure facilities relating to the proposed housing increase.

Over the past 15 years or so, TSF have drawn-up a number of possible mixed-development schemes for discussion purposes, mainly centred on Dunsley Farm, that have generally won support from Tring residents and TTC members of all political persuasions, including those that also sit on DBC. In the past, TSF have endeavoured to harmonise their representations to DBC with TTC on the local plan and only last month TTC agreed that we would continue to work together to hopefully assist in the production of a Local Plan that is both sustainable and acceptable to the majority.

To this end we request that representatives from TSF and TTC are included in early discussions with DBC officers in the preparation of the Draft Masterplan for Tring, as described in the Emerging Draft Local Plan. Further discussions could then take place with landowners, including Herts CC and Harrow Estates. **There is a firm belief held by the TSF Executive Committee and senior TTC and DBC councillors that it is eminently possible to draw up a consensual Masterplan for Tring, thereby saving an enormous amount of time, effort and money contesting matters 5at the public enquiry.**

We do not feel that it is our place to comment on the amount of housing proposed for either Tring or Dacorum as a whole; TSF's interests are to ensure that the current shortfall of land and facilities available for sport and leisure is recognised in the new Local Plan and in addition, that these increases are proportional to the proposed increase in the population of Tring over the Plan period. However, we shall endeavour to explain in these comments why some of the proposed sites allocated for various elements of the Plan should, in TSF's opinion, be changed from those proposed. We hope to show how a considered approach to the sports and leisure locations can have massive benefits to the Environment and to the wishes of the populous.

We understand the reasons why the decision has been made to proceed with the consultation under Regulation 18, but hold the view that it is not for us to comment for or against this process, although we acknowledge that the inevitable decrees from Central Govt. following the Planning White Paper and the apparent U-turn in their thinking regarding housing

numbers in particular will have a serious impact on the Local Plan preparation in terms of its content and timetable. For this reason, our comments are mainly in general terms only; we appreciate that it will be all hands to the deck once accurate housing numbers a) for Dacorum and b) for Tring in particular are known. Recommended changes to the Plan content are of course based on the current proposed numbers.

Our comments on the **Draft Emerging Plan** are as follows:

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12136

**Person ID** 1269413

**Full Name** Mr Chris Wallis

**Organisation Details** Hon. Director of Development  
Tring Sports Forum

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

23.145 Dunsley Farm should also include A) at least 16 hectares of sports land, as per previous submissions to DBC by TTC and TSF, linking the two existing sports hubs of Pendley and the Cricket/Tennis/Hockey hub, B) a car park C) a section of tree-lined cycleway/Leisure Trail, linking the Town Centre to the Railway Station.

Then:

- 1 Link Sports Hubs
- 2 Existing Clubs in both hubs will be able to expand
- 3 Clubs can continue sharing facilities e.g. Hockey Club using TPCC facilities, but with new pitches, if sufficient land, if not they could move to the new hub planned for East Tring and share sand pitches with the new school
- 4 Indoor Tennis Courts and an Indoor cricket school can link to the existing TPCC clubhouse
- 5 With land swaps, Tring Tornadoes and TRUFC can accommodate their expansion needs, an AWP can be built for shared football use and Tring Athletic can move their 2nd pitch closer to their facilities
- 6 Tring Squash Club can build extra courts needed
- 7 Tring Tornadoes can utilise existing farm buildings on Cow Lane Farm for changing, clubhouse, etc.
- 8 The land already designated for Tring School overflow adjacent to TPCC could have shared use

- 9 The existing Clubs can build on their coaching programmes with the schools, etc.
  - 0 Should the housing numbers be vastly reduced, this site could be made to work for all of the stakeholder clubs, even if the Tring East sites are abandoned.
  - 1 Tring Bowls Club can consider building their indoor courts
  - 2 A green buffer would be formed separating the existing and new housing
  - 3 Car Parking
  - 4 Parking spaces at the East and West end of the site and on the existing hubs can be created, alleviating many dangerous parking problems, particularly in Cow Lane
  - 5 Cycleway etc.
  - 6 The new, safe Green route could run all the way from Pound Meadow, through the site to the Pendley Hub, past the Pendley Hotel entrance and through the triangular-shaped land between Cow Lane and Station Road, then linking -up with the new cycleway proposed to the station. This would overcome the problems of the shared use pathway/cycleway between the Robin Hood and Cow Lane being too narrow.
  - 7 The New Sports & Leisure Hub
  - 8 The indoor and outdoor facilities can be shared with the proposed new secondary school
  - 9 A leisure-centre operator would be interested in operating this facility
  - 0 Many smaller 'indoor' clubs could be accommodated
  - 2 A shared much-needed athletics track is a possibility
  - 2 Tring Tornadoes' netballers could be accommodated here and the facilities shared with the school
- 23.147 The key objectives seem to recognise the link above, maybe this anomaly should be made clearer?
- 23.148-23.149 The Dunsley Farm employment quantity should be reduced considerably
- 23.150 Dunsley Farm is the wrong location
- 23.151-23.165 Many of these clauses should be re-written once Masterplans for the sites have been agreed, reflecting the changes to the mix.
- Policy SP24 – Delivering growth in East Tring**  
No objections
- Policy SP25 – Delivering growth in South-East Tring**  
No objections

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12147

**Person ID** 1160677

**Full Name** Mr Paul Doughty

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p> <p>In the 35 years I have lived in Tring, the drainage and access to Sites Tr02 &amp; Tr03 have NEVER been adequate, and it most definitely cannot cope with any additional disruption without massive infrastructure upgrades before this all starts.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12199
<b>Person ID</b>	1145481
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Brian Kazer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Section 23.147 “Tring Home: Key Objectives” (Pages 234/5)</p> <p>The Plan states “provide open space / green corridors linking the development with adjoining recreational open space at Tring Park Cricket Club and Tring Rugby and Football Clubs and open countryside to the south”.</p> <p>This point makes a major error, with severe consequences for biodiversity, by confusing open, green spaces with wildlife buffer spaces and/or corridors. This same confusion occurs many times throughout the Plan. A green/open space or sports field is not wildlife space or corridor; not enabling threatened species to have sustainable habitats. There is a need for all of these – but to meet NPPF requirements - “wildlife corridors” need to be made explicit and mapped ( NPPF para174) , along with their linkage to existing wild/natural areas.</p> <p>Section 23.149 “Tring Employment” (Page 235)</p> <p>The retention of “warehousing” at Tr01 is strongly opposed. No evidence base is provided to justify this and there is no evidence in Plan of discussion with Aylesbury Vale District Council despite the availability of land for warehousing just 3 miles west of Tring on the A41 dual carriageway. Warehousing provides minimal jobs, is land hungry (thus removing land from higher employment use eg residential home), is usually 24/7 thus generating noise pollution, light pollution, and vehicle emission pollution during unsocial hours/night-time. Warehousing option at Tr01 should be removed.</p> <p>Tr01. If development here is retained in final Plan despite the alternative case made in response to question 5, I would support employment provision only as small units designed with capability for alteration to home hubs. The Covid pandemic has proven the need for “home working” hubs, where users can support local businesses eg copy shop/stationers on Tring High St, and the independent cafes, and reduce carbon footprint/congestion due to travel. No large employment spaces should be allowed at Tr01, since proposals elsewhere in Plan are to provide those on west side of Tring.</p>



Section 23.152 “Tring Movement” (Page 235)

“With the exception of one or two congestion points such as Brook Street ...Tring does not suffer significant [traffic] problems”.

This statement is wrong. There are frequent long tailbacks in both directions at Tring High St because of its very narrow width and deliveries to premises. Even at the best of times it is very difficult for buses to pass each other. This problem also causes delays to buses, resulting in them unable to keep to timetable resulting in fewer and fewer people using bus services (this will recur after end of Covid pandemic). There is often congestion at junction of Station Road and London Road.

Section 23.158 “Tring Movement” (Page 236)

States “an assessment of parking demand and mitigation measures should accompany the development of Growth Area”.

I agree, noting such assessments seem to be required by NPPF para 108 to be within the Local Plan. Especially given the proposed growth of Tring by 55%, it is very disappointing to note an apparent absence of such an assessment.

Both parking in Tring centre will be very problematic, as will a huge increase more cars attempting to use Tring station where the car park was full before 8 am every weekday morning before Covid pandemic.

The Tring station parking capacity issue is a major problem for Tring. Not only does it result in illegal parking within walking distance of the station, it is known commuters park on Tring residential streets, then car share to the station. This causes problems on many residential streets, which will be greatly exacerbated should the Plan proposals, on top of the commuting from the major residential developments in Buckinghamshire just 2 or 3 miles from Tring.

I would have hoped that the Plan would have proposed some creative solutions in collaboration with Network Rail e.g. designing new developments to support autonomous electric transport; ensuring that those sharing cars and EV owners would get preferential parking and reduced rates; electric shuttle buses

I would like to see agreed, joined-up plans to resolve the above problems before Tring’s new development of the scale planned goes ahead.

Policy SP24 – Delivering Growth in East Tring (Page 239) paragraph 6

and Policy SP25 – Delivering Growth in South East Tring (Page 240) paragraph 6

The word “exemplar” is used but not expanded upon. I offer below some examples of how “exemplar” could be delivered.

Exemplar energy hierarchy would be to require the highest possible performance of the building fabric as first priority in house build (e.g. Passivhaus standard, energy-focused site design).

Exemplar energy generation could be an approach that seeks to use heat and power microgeneration technology in every building as a default position.

The exemplar approach should be applied to all buildings within the proposed development, including residential, commercial, retail, schools etc. Car parking areas could use 'solar carports' which could also become charging hubs for EVs, electric bikes etc.

Mapping of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy is required by NPPF para151b.

Masterplans for Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 should include for the ability for excess electricity generation to be used locally on site by other occupants. This is already the done in some European countries (e.g., Germany) and looks likely to be feasible in UK before the end of this decade.

For the new developments proposed, there is an opportunity to incorporate the necessary provisions (space, infrastructure) for creating a largely independent local renewable energy grid, which would allow the following principles to be implemented:

- Residents and businesses generate most of their electricity and heat needs on-premises.
- Excess (electricity) generation would be fed to a local/on-site energy storage scheme, available for consumption by other residents/businesses.
- If the total generation in the local grid exceeds the total consumption at a given time, the excess may either be stored or exported to the wider grid (in our area UK Power Networks at present).
- If the total consumption in the total grid exceeds the total generation plus the energy which can be delivered from the energy storage system, additional power is drawn centrally from the wider grid.

Depending on the technology deployed, the electrical energy requirements and the timeframe, there may or may not still be the need for an 'emergency' direct feed from the individual premises to the wider grid. 'Emergency heat' would come from an electric heat pump or similar on-premises.

This would enable the newly developed areas to run almost fully on renewably generated heat and electricity, increasing resilience, minimising CO2-emissions, and promoting conscious use of valuable resources. A complementary factor would be having low-energy buildings in the first instance.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS12211
<b>Person ID</b>	1269470
<b>Full Name</b>	PHILIP MOORE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b><u>Tring delivery strategy</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 For all the reasons noted above, we object to the entire Tring delivery strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It stems from an a priori flawed approach to housing need in which constraints on building on Green Belt land have not been properly considered against the starting assumption for numbers;</li> <li>• It is proposed despite DBC not having shown that they have exhausted all other options before considering Green Belt land;</li> <li>• It is based on one of a number of options, the rationale of which is confused and insufficient, and appears to have been driven by an unexplicit motivation to secure infrastructure build;</li> <li>• It results in a massively disproportionate impact on Tring and its surroundings, which is allegedly but incorrectly presented as ‘unavoidable’ and which has not been flagged for Tring residents to properly consider.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>1 There are a large number of further specific problems with the detail of the Tring delivery strategy. These are variously flowing from the following (<u>details are set out below</u>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that assumptions and conclusions for the 2017 "Issues &amp; Options" consultation seem to have been carried over to plans that are now different and / or bigger;</li> <li>• The fact that there are proposals that are presented as reasonable, but which actually contradict the stated aims of the Emerging Strategy;</li> <li>• The fact that in many cases, DBC has attempted to offer mitigation strategies, but the mitigation is variously insufficient and based on outdated or otherwise incorrect assumptions;</li> <li>• The fact that there are too many caveats and vagueness of intent for an intended Local Plan proposing such significant impact on the character of the town and surroundings.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Green Belt</b></p>

1 **Overall, delivery and ‘mitigation’ of a “comprehensively planned new neighbourhood to the East of [Tring]” cannot ‘take into account sensitive views, landscape and protected environmental land’.** It is not possible to reconcile construction of an entirely new neighbourhood of 2000 plus houses, with associated infrastructure with the destruction of natural, green open spaces of high quality agricultural land designated as Green Belt and affording key settings for the AONB.

1 **The Emerging Strategy does not take into account the potential for the Chilterns AONB to be designated a National Park.** In 2019 the independent Glover Landscapes Review report recommended that the Chilterns AONB be designated a National Park, thus recognising the extremely valuable benefits which the AONB already contributes to the UK and its future potential. The Chilterns are significant in affording easy access to natural, unspoilt, tranquil and green landscapes, now widely recognised as of key value to mental and physical well-being for city dwellers. To permanently destroy large swathes of Green Belt sites abutting the Chilterns AONB, as the Emerging Strategy proposes, could negatively affect the possibility of National Park status.

1 **Specifically, Tring bears the brunt of loss of Green Belt land despite its smaller size and more rural character.** The proposal sees Tring taking on  $(2274/5945) = 38\%$  of all of the Green Belt allocation, compared to  $(1876/5945) = 32\%$  for Berkhamsted, and  $(1500/5945) = 25\%$  for Hemel Hempstead.

1 **Compounding the above, the Green Belt land chosen for allocation in Tring is some of the best Green Belt land in the Borough, which according to NPPF para 134 fulfils the 5 uses of Green Belt and so should not be considered expendable.** Notable characteristics of Tring’s Green Belt include the following:

- Agricultural Grade 2 land (“very good”)
- Providing views to/from and a gateway into the Chilterns AONB
- Providing a soft setting for the Grand Union Canal
- Providing a soft setting for Pendley Manor
- Ancient hedgerows (some over 600 years old)
- Important wildlife corridors & nature sites, such as Cow Lane Farm
- Historic features such as Marshcroft Lane (a Roman road) and its listed canal bridge

These fulfil the 5 uses of Green Belt as set out by NPPF paragraph 134 and cannot be considered ‘scrappy’ or expendable in terms of Green Belt function.

1 **The quality and function of this Green Belt land around Tring was partly accepted within the Green Belt Review that forms part of DBC’s Evidence Base, but this evidence then appears to have been disregarded during the formation of an allocation strategy.** It appears that land has been chosen mainly for the convenience of meeting housing targets, rather than consideration of the harm that such allocation would cause. Such a strategy

would fail examination under NPPF paragraph 137: "*Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced*".

- 1 Allocation of this land would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site and also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their 'openness and sense of permanence' in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with NPPF paragraph 136.**

#### **Size of sites**

- 1 There is an assumption that larger parcels of developments are needed, which DBC attempts to justify through circular and flawed logic:**
  - It seems possible that this assumption is led, as noted above, by a desire to secure amenities that would not in fact otherwise be needed (i.e. a secondary school). 23.147 states that the scale of the strategic sites "*offers benefits for infrastructure co-ordination and delivery, enabling a fuller range of site and town-wide infrastructure needs to be considered and planned for that would otherwise not be possible, especially the need for two 2FE primary schools, a 6FE secondary school and significant levels of formal and informal open space.*" This is circular logic;
  - The Emerging Strategy appears locked into the thinking that strategic facilities can only be delivered to very large scale sites. This is an assertion that has not been proven through a consideration of what else would be possible on smaller sites.

#### **Densification**

- 1 Section 5.5 of the Emerging Strategy asserts that an urban densification strategy would detract from the character of Tring (and Berkhamsted), but no evidence was provided for this claim:**
  - There has been no evidenced position provided by DBC to justify a different approach to the intensification of sites within Tring in comparison to Hemel Hempstead;
  - No assessments have been undertaken to assess the opportunities to intensify development within the existing settlement of Tring through redevelopment of brownfield sites, or by way of consideration of increasing density of available sites;
  - Irrespective of the eventual housing supply requirement, there is a requirement to establish the opportunities within the existing settlement boundaries before land outside of it is considered. The same approach to assessment is required within Tring as was undertaken in Hemel Hempstead.
- 1 The Emerging Strategy proposes an alternative to urban densification – "*mainly through expansions in a way that manages landscape and Green Belt impacts*" – which it then fails to deliver.** The impacts will not be managed based on the proposed mitigation strategies (see further below), and as set out above, do not need to happen in the first place.

#### **Green Spaces**

1 **The proposals would ruin green spaces around Tring widely used for walking, cycling, riding, dog-walking, running, and including a good network of well-used public rights of way which provide access, instead offering an artificially contrived, man-made green space.** These latter spaces would be appropriate in an urban setting, but Tring, Berkhamsted and the villages would lose the quality of green countryside and access which they already enjoy.

1 **There is confusion throughout between green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors; and wildlife corridors and their linkages are not explicitly mapped out as required by NPPF paragraph 174.**

1 **The Emerging Strategy fails to offer any measures which would alleviate or offer alternatives to diminish, or at least contain, the pressures on Tring Park, Tring Reservoirs, the Grand Union Canal and Ashridge which the SA identifies (B1.4):**

- The SA notes that “[a]s urban population increases, pressures on access to countryside and these key attractions will increase”. Increasing housing in the Borough by nearly 20,000 over the next 18 years will serve only to increase pressure on these key natural resources which cannot be offset by a green play area or open space surrounded by high density housing;
- The SA notes that (p46) *‘[the Council] considers the allocation of 1,400 homes at East of Tring will enable significant amounts of public open space to be provided, including a new public park of around 20 hectares on land classified as Grade 2. The Council considers that these requirements mitigate the impact that development would have on this particular objective.’* Twenty hectares is less than one sixth the area of the existing Tring Park, which the SA already reports to be suffering from ‘visitor pressures’. The provision of 20 hectares of public park is wholly inadequate, especially coupled with the complete lack of further mitigating action for developing on Green Belt land and the absence of any joined-up plan for linking other green spaces impacted by the proposed developments.

1 **The NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces, but there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around Tring.** This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key attractive and popular green spaces of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.

#### **Highways network**

1 **Options for both road connections and sustainable travel have NOT been adequately explored despite the fact that the SA page 43 notes that DBC’s considerations include ‘*minimising, where possible, adverse impacts on the highway network and seeking to maximise opportunities for supporting sustainable modes of travel*’.** In particular for a TR03/TR02, north–south road, connectivity has not been considered beyond vague notions that something will be required. This is nowhere near concrete enough.

## Traffic and transport

- 1 **The delivery strategy will not be able to deliver on its aim of “walkable neighbourhoods”.** The *midpoints* of the new neighbourhoods planned for the East of Tring are 1 mile from the town centre. This is the limit of the 20 minute “walkability” threshold for fit adults, and beyond the threshold for elderly people, parents with buggies, or those who are carrying shopping. Under these circumstances, it is hard to see how policy SP24 can deliver on its aim of “walkable neighbourhoods”.
  
- 1 **Thousands of new houses mean thousands more cars in the town, and the distances mentioned above will inevitably lead to higher car dependency in the new neighbourhoods. This will mean more traffic to and from the town centre: more congestion, more noise, more pollution, and higher CO2 emissions. The proposed mitigation is vague or faulty:**
  - Mention at 152 of "one or two congestion points" is misleading; the solution seems to be creating an "East Tring Bypass" via Marshcroft Lane. These congestion points mainly affect TR02/03, the least walkable new neighbourhoods;
  - At 23.154 there is mention of an East-West cycle way but with no proposed route;
  - At 23.156 there is a mention that a new north-south road "could help congestion" – but this is a vague aspiration, with no plan, no route, no analysis (contrary to NPPF paragraph 108c which requires these);
  - Traffic would be exacerbated by any plans to build a new supermarket.
  
- 1 **The Emerging Strategy fails to acknowledge existing parking problems and so proposals for mitigation are inadequate:**
  - Increased traffic will inevitably lead to increased need for parking, both in the town centre and at the train station. The town already had problems with provision of parking;
  - A new cycle path from Pitstone to Tring Station might encourage a ‘modal shift’ for commuters from Pitstone and join up with the existing facility on Westfield Road, but this is unlikely to offset demand created elsewhere;
  - Tring Station carpark is often already full, with commuters driving further to Berkhamsted.
  
- 1 **In non-pandemic times rail capacity at Tring is oversubscribed. There should be joined up plans for increasing rail capacity as a prerequisite for any development.** Working patterns may change with COVID and working from home, but these unknowns do not provide a sound basis on which to make such a radical plan.

## Loss of Character

- 1 **Despite claiming to want to “*promote the distinctiveness of each of Dacorum’s towns and villages, reinforcing their role and character*” the Tring delivery strategy is likely to result in a number of harms, such as (further details in site specific comments below):**

- Industrial buildings on London Road detracting from the entrance to Tring, which is currently seen as attractive;
- A new supermarket in the town centre damaging our ‘Old English’ look and feel;
- More car dependent neighbourhood's will erode the town's “go by foot” feeling, and impact the passing trade of our distinctive shops;
- More distant neighbourhoods risk eroding our sense of community, and creating “them and us” feelings;
- More traffic on the High Street might discourage our tradition of parades and festivals (Summer Carnival; Christmas Festival);
- A distinct loss of heritage (further details below) through the ‘translocation’ of Tring Museum, the loss of Tring Marketplace, harm to Marshcroft Lane and harm to Jeacock’s Orchard.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12242

**Person ID** 1269479

**Full Name** BARBARA HARVEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive



harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12265
<b>Person ID</b>	1269483
<b>Full Name</b>	LAURA JOHNSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I oppose the Tring allocations (Tr01-Tr06).</p> <p>The number of new houses within the Tring allocation is disproportionate in comparison to the existing number of houses within Tring and will completely change the status and character of Tring as a historic market town.</p>

I am concerned that the current infrastructure and services in Tring will not support this level of proposed development. Roads are already congested, local schools are already oversubscribed and GP surgeries are already at capacity with long waits for appointments.

The Tring proposed developments are on Green Belt and AONB sites. Once our beautiful countryside is destroyed, it is destroyed forever and for all future generations. These developments will unnecessarily take huge chunks out of our countryside, reducing our ability to exercise locally and breathe fresh air. There is no justification for the release of this Green Belt and AONB land.

There is not sufficient employment within the local area to support this level of additional housing. This is likely to lead to additional commuting either by car (increasing carbon emissions) or by train (pre Covid-19 Tring Station car park was already at full capacity). All will negatively impact the health and safety of our children.

I understand that the number of new houses allocated to Tring was determined by out of date 2014 statistics. Furthermore since the 'Local Plan' was created the central government algorithm to calculate target housing has been updated with a higher emphasis on the Midlands and the North. While I appreciate that a certain level of new, affordable, sustainable, energy efficient housing is required I urge the 'Local Plan' to be reviewed again considering up to date statistics (including consideration of the impact of a post Covid-19 world) and housing targets.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12286

**Person ID** 1269485

**Full Name** NICOLA HULSE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12319
<b>Person ID</b>	1264637
<b>Full Name</b>	Ollie Parrish
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

<p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Tring Delivery Strategy</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS12361</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1269491</p>
<p><b>Full Name</b></p>	<p>Mr David Eeley</p>
<p><b>Organisation Details</b></p>	
<p><b>Agent ID</b></p>	
<p><b>Agent Full Name</b></p>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12367
<b>Person ID</b>	1269492
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Isabelle Gorton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12401
<b>Person ID</b>	1269497
<b>Full Name</b>	MICHAEL RUDIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring is totally out of proportion especially when compared to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. The proportion of growth allocated to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth. I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would irreversibly damage and harm the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12428
<b>Person ID</b>	1146040

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Macdonald
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Berkhamsted &amp; Tring Developments</b></p> <p>I welcome the commitment to genuinely affordable housing to be included in developments in Berkhamsted and Tring but believe affordable needs to be properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.</p> <p>The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.</p> <p>The plan must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.</p> <p>To sustain an increase in population, improvements in infrastructure need to be implemented as houses are built. These are commuter towns and residents rely on transport to make journeys out of the town to travel to work. The present rail and road networks will not sustain such an increase in population.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12443
<b>Person ID</b>	1146040
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Macdonald
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	



* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12445
<b>Person ID</b>	1146040
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rachel Macdonald
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p>

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

[Tring image.jpg](#)

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS12452

**Person ID**

1269509

**Full Name**

Mr Anthony Mackinder

**Organisation Details**

Community Action Dacorum

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I fully endorse all the comments made by the Tring In Transition team.

All points made in their detailed response are valid and I would also like to raise some additional points.

Nowhere in the document that I have seen is there any planning for any additional recreational facilities apart from green spaces.

There should be specific mention of additional community centres to cater for the expected growth in population specifically aimed at the older members of the community.

I am the Repair Sheds Officer working for Community Action Dacorum, and the aim of our project is to provide Sheds in all towns in Dacorum, where men & women can work together shoulder to shoulder working on projects to improve their mental health and wellbeing.

These projects help the local environment by making items out of recycled wood and repairing items rather than discarding them into unsustainable landfill.

It should be written into all local plans that developers MUST provide these facilities as part of the bid process.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS12493

<b>Person ID</b>	1269524
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID ATKINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS12507
<b>Person ID</b>	1269527
<b>Full Name</b>	JULIAN SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12536
<b>Person ID</b>	1269456
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms R & C R & Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is seen expedient to virtually double the size of Tring? I understand it has good access to the A41 road but the station is almost 2 miles from the town centre. Tring is already a dormitory town. Your proposed development cannot be seen as environmentally sound. Where are the local jobs to be found in Tring? Only one symbol on your development plan of Tring indicates a small 'new employment' area.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12722
<b>Person ID</b>	1269603
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Roger Hopkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Tring

The plan refers to the distinctiveness of towns, but does not indicate what features are perceived to actually make each town distinctive.

Tring is very close to the Buckinghamshire border. Have planners taken into consideration the large number houses and other facilities e.g. warehousing, being built nearby? Also the redevelopment of Halton due to take place in the future. If one includes these developments within a few miles, this area is becoming very overdeveloped.

The main difficulty with the plan is that the number of homes planned for Tring is disproportionately large compared with the rest of Dacorum. This will incur loss of Green Belt and the homes will impinge on the AONB. There will also be problems in that the development will overwhelm existing infrastructure. New roads will not solve the problem.

I would prefer to see more houses built around the Bulbourne area. This would have a reduced effect on the AONB. There are already commercial buildings there, a new supermarket could be built which would serve that side of Tring and also the villages north of Tring. It would be better than putting a new supermarket in the centre of Tring and eliminating the working farms in the Dunsley area, which would create more traffic congestion in the centre of town. There is a proposal of warehousing on the Dunsley site which would make a very unattractive entrance to the town. The Bulbourne area has access to the M1 and Tring Station without having to go through Tring.

The COVID pandemic has accelerated changes which were already taking place, such as; working from home and the reduction in retail space required with more of us making purchases on line. More people than ever are enjoying the countryside. Does the plan have the capacity to be flexible enough to meet changing trends?

To avoid the town centre and car parks becoming congested, public transport would be required between the station and around the new development areas. Clearer detail is needed on how this would be managed.

More detail is required on how the loss of habitat will be mitigated. No mention is made of retention of hedgrows etc. Wildlife corridors should be clearly defined and adequate to the purpose. (A cricket pitch might be green, but it is not a wildlife corridor.)

The plan should state that houses will be built to a very high standard of energy efficiency, and include provision for installation of renewable energy (e.g. solar panels), in order to meet Dacorum's stated aim of being zero carbon by 2030.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12735

**Person ID** 1165736

<b>Full Name</b>	Margaret McHugh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>These proposals are completely inappropriate for a town the size of Tring that is already suffering congestion with its current population level. To propose an increase of 50% in such a restricted access small market town is not acceptable and not meeting any actual targets as no such targets were set by central government.</p> <p>The proposal goes against government guidelines to prevent development creep joining towns and settlement together and worse it goes completely against the guidelines regarding the use of green belt for development which is allowed only in extreme circumstances and must be fully justified which is not the case here. The Council has not done its work.</p> <p>To suggest that Tring Station could cope with greater capacity, once back to normal working, indicates that those proposing this have not done their research. West Midland Trains 2019 survey found that Tring Station already has the widest user catchment area of any station on their whole network with people driving even from as far as Luton to use Tring Station. It also has very poor transport links to and from the station making driving the only viable means of access. Station road is already dangerously congested in normal peak hours with cars accessing the car park and dropping off. There is no scope for any increase and it has been accepted that it is not financially viable to run a bus service that would offer a viable alternative.</p> <p>The proposed housing would not be for locally employed people as it would, in the majority, be outside their price bracket of locally employed people. It would be aimed at attracting commuters from London putting ever more pressure on local services and amenities, roads and transport.</p> <p>This whole plan needs reviewing as it is inappropriate for the area and is not in line or up to date with government recommendations.</p> <p>In addition it is entirely inappropriate to run a consultation of such importance during this pandemic when most of the affected population are, by law, restricted from becoming fully involved.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Margaret McHugh - Aldbury Parish Council - Dacorum local plan.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12780
<b>Person ID</b>	1269628

<b>Full Name</b>	Steven Bragg
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy



<b>ID</b>	EGS12831
<b>Person ID</b>	1263603
<b>Full Name</b>	Craig Mitchell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We dont have the space, the resources, the infrastructure for another build of this size, our Schools and surgeries arent built to facilitate an increase to the population of this size. In turn to this we have the natural fauna and flora that has managed to survive to this point, With further building this will be decimated and some of this wont make a comeback
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12832
<b>Person ID</b>	1269645
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Hazel Kay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Tring Allocations TR01 to TR06 I am against these plans.  Tring is a small town with limited facilities such as Doctors and schools. We have lost the health centre to housing a few years ago and there is no dedicated indoor community space for the current population, other than that leased by Tring Together Charity which carries out many of the annual events for the town throughout the year.

Tring is lacking green public space within the town centre and amongst the current housing estates. The high street and surrounding streets are narrow and suffer from traffic congestion. The town is already densely populated with housing and has very little industry for those living in the town.

The recent LA5 housing has added huge numbers to the town already with no increased capacity in services.

There are very few open spaces within the town and residents rely on the two areas of green belt for recreation and wellbeing. Tring park is not accessible for those with a disability, leaving the area along Marshcroft lane and along the canal as the only open space that is accessible.

The only other green space in the Grove area is next to Tring school and is very small. It does not provide a space to relax.

Tring does not need all this additional housing, especially housing that spreads the town out away from the centre. There is no evidence that more housing is needed in Tring specifically, and housing should be close to employment, not in towns where employment is scarce.

We should be increasing recreational space in and around the town, not taking away the only option for access to peaceful countryside and wildlife.

The Marshcroft lane area floods in the fields between it and Station Road and is not suitable to be built on for this reason alone. Also, the canal access is the only wheelchair and buggy-friendly access to the canal path. The lane is abundant with wildlife and hedgerows full of blackberries, sloe and elderberries. If a road from Station Road to Bulbourne Road crossed Marshcroft lane it would ruin the peace and wildlife. It would need a bridge or underpass to keep walkers safe from traffic, and no amount of wildlife corridor would replace this small haven.

TR02 has access issues, as Grove Road is narrow in places, with street parking close to Grove Road primary school. There are already issues of missing footpath next to a blind bend where children walk to and from school close to the (assumed) entrance. Although this land is not publicly-available, it is green space, rather than more houses, bringing more people, cars and traffic and pollution. Ideally, the land should be bought for public access and recreation.

This plan has been cobbled together in haste, with incorrect information and no sense of what a small town like Tring can cope with.

Tring does not need another supermarket. Any additional shopping is best brought into the town centre to concentrate shopping within the high street to create a community feel for residents. People can grocery shop online. Shopping in person should be a pleasant experience in the town centre, alongside other shops. It is difficult enough to keep the shops we have. Three restaurants have closed in the past year and many other shops are empty. We don't want a town that is just somewhere to live, but work and leisure are found elsewhere.

It might be best for the fire station to be moved to a better, more accessible location, perhaps over-55 or sheltered housing could be in its place, provided that access onto Brook Street wasn't an issue.

This country needs to be considering climate change and our wellbeing. This plan is out of date with current needs and out of step with current thinking on a better, healthier way of living and working. Proposals like these stem from an easy fix to a ridiculous policy of looking for more housing based on some national algorithm, not actual need in our town. Just

because the land proposed for housing has been bought by developers looking to make money, does not mean that our local representatives should let them.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12835

**Person ID** 1269646

**Full Name** Colin McHugh

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Tring Development:

I find it both mentally and physicaly exhausting to realise that DBC are even considering a development of these proportions in Tring. Looking at the plans, it looks like Tring has drawn the short straw with by far the biggest development in the borough, dwarfed by these plans.

In light of the current CoVid situation, I would have thought that LESS development and LESS overcrowding would be the sensible path to follow!

Please reconsider the actual scale of these proposals and at best cancel this madness and/or alter these plans accordingly!

The only alternative that many residents will have is to sell up and leave the DBC borough for greener pastures!

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12885

<b>Person ID</b>	1269665
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Hicks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring Delivery Strategy. 23.137 should also state Tring Park is an SSSI, the second largest area of chalk grassland in the county. 23.140 should also state the towns sensitivities in respect of its local ecology, one of the richest in Hertfordshire including Tring Park, Tring Woodlands, Tring Reservoirs, College Lake, Aldbury Nowers and Ashridge as well as a number of Local Wildlife Sites. Most of these are likely to suffer from increased recreational pressure or demands – a point wholly missing from the supporting text.</p> <p>23.147 The proposed developments will directly abut the AONB and degrade its edges, already severely degraded by the sports facilities in Cow Lane, with formal pitches and floodlighting. The AONB boundary should be reconsidered if possible. Protection / translocation of the Local Wildlife Site in Cow Lane also needs to secure its appropriate management, without which it will be lost in any event.</p> <p>Policy SP23 - Delivering Growth in Tring will have significant land management and environmental impacts which have not been addressed. The Town Centre regeneration area will be equally damaging to retail and community activities. All of these are the essential components of Sustainable Development.</p> <p>The museum itself is an historic building, the last original remnant of the former livestock market. The Brook Street Market Site is the location of Tring Farmers Market, one of the first established Farmers Markets in the country and the first in Hertfordshire. The site is also used for Tring Auctions - one of the most iconic enterprises in the region. Unless impacts on these are addressed, the plan is not sustainable.</p> <p>Policy SP24 - Delivering Growth in East Tring. Sp24.4 is supported in the event development is approved. It is important to provide a comprehensive green infrastructure network and biodiversity net gains (which will be mandatory). The old Farmers Weekly PYO orchard – part of the cultural heritage of the former Marshcroft Farm - should be retained and managed as a community orchard. Other opportunities to grow food should be pursued, particularly given that the development will destroy a large expanse of productive farmland. A SANG must surely be needed to address a substantial recreational demand and avoid damaging other local sites. The ambiguity confirms the plan is not sustainable.</p>

Policy SP25 - Delivering Growth at South East Tring.

One of the largest growth areas in the Borough, SANG will be provided if required 23.165. Again, the ambiguity is unsustainable. The Garden City principles are supported - but these are, by default, compromised by the loss of productive farmland which was one of the guiding principles of the movement.

GI and biodiversity gains are supported, but the loss of a Local Wildlife Site, loss of a mixed farm benefitting from Higher Level Stewardship (at the bequest of the HCC's Head of the Rural Estate at the time), loss of the presence of Ridge and Furrow archaeological features (which cannot be translocated) and loss of a second livestock farm managing other land in and around Dacorum – is wholly unsustainable. Opportunities to grow food are supported but seen in the context of the loss of two active farms and farmland – is no compensation. The presence of Tring Brewery – one of the most successful artisan breweries in the country – is also not recognised, nor is the presence of a substantial Rothschild farmhouse which formed part of the original model farm. Any development must also take into consideration the setting of the adjacent WWI smallholding, a curtilage-listed site of national importance also supporting two priority habitats. This policy therefore conflicts with the aims of Sustainable Development.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12962

**Person ID** 1269765

**Full Name** CAROLINE SMITH

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12964

<b>Person ID</b>	1269768
<b>Full Name</b>	DANIEL CARTLAND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. My name was not included in the GFRA response because I joined the GFRA after the response was finalised and submitted. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12965
<b>Person ID</b>	1269769
<b>Full Name</b>	LINDA CARTLAND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. My name was not included in the GFRA response because I joined the GFRA after the response was finalised and submitted. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.</i>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12983
<b>Person ID</b>	1269776
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHEN MACKENZIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The scale and scope of the plan for Tring appears to have gown significantly over the last years, with additions appearing to have been added without consideration to earlier proposals. The result is a piecemeal collection of developments that take little account of interaction between sites and their combined impact on the mechanics and character of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale and scope of the proposed additions to and developments in Tring are excessive and They do not meet the Plans stated aim of being 'compatible with maintaining and enhancing the character' of existing towns and villages.</li> </ul> <p>NPPF para 72c requires net environmental gain when greenbelt is release for development. There is not indication of how this would be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There seems to be a circular argument in play to the effect that to enable better facilities for the town any development must be on a large scale, which itself would require more facilities. This seems flawed. Provision of deveopment and facilities should be defined by demonstrable need within the</li> <li>There is no detail as to how the road infrastructure around and through TR03 would be resolved. The proposal is a major development adjacent to SSSI and AONB with entirely inadequate existing It's inappropriate to not detail what the impact of solving these issues would be.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12984
<b>Person ID</b>	1269776
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHEN MACKENZIE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tring's distinctive character would be swamped by the proposals. The increase in households vs. the towns current size is disproportionate and excessive. New housing development should be consistent with actual demonstrable need, and should address the need for affordable starter</li> <li>• The level of development along the A41 corridor in recent decades has greatly increased the level of traffic on a road that is ill suited to this level of use. The topology of the road and the inadequate slip roads are already dangerous, as demonstrated by the regular serious accidents. When the proposed Tring growth is combined with the major development in Kings Langley, Berkhamsted, Hemmel Hempsted and particularly Aylesbury, A41 traffic will become unsustainable and critically</li> <li>• There appears to have been little coordination with Buckinghamshire County Council in drawing up the plan. For example why location industrial units in Tring town center (TR06) when there is major provision for this down the A41 at Collage Road. Likewise with respect to my comments above regarding A41 traffic</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13016
<b>Person ID</b>	1164731
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Turnbull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13017
<b>Person ID</b>	1164731
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Turnbull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13057
<b>Person ID</b>	1270013
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Daniel Ritchie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p>

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13066
<b>Person ID</b>	865165
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Rosemarie Hollinghurst
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
<b>* Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I will talk about Tring as it is my home.</p> <p>The strategy as it stands proposes that Tring will grow by 55 %.</p> <p>The projected figures for housing needs have been inflated by using the 2014 ONS baseline instead of the more up to date figures from 2018.</p> <p>The algorithm for calculating the Tring housing allocation of 2700 new houses defies understanding. It implies that in every second house in Tring there are people desperate to move out and into new housing?!</p> <p>What Tring really needs is affordable housing and this will not be forthcoming in sufficient quantity under this new Local Plan.</p> <p>With reference to the NPPF and the Green Belt this plan is NOT in accordance with the national framework.</p> <p>To quote 23.142 “A significant amount of the future housing (around 2200 dwellings) will be delivered as urban extensions through release from the Green Belt of the following strategic sites: East of Tring, New Mill, Dunsley Farm”.</p> <p>In one short sentence 170 hectares of Green Belt land abutting Tring and abutting the AONB disappears! Much is made of the Green Belt when you describe ‘the Countryside’ but only this one sentence which airbrushes the Green Belt out, when discussing Tring. That GB does not belong to Dacorum, or to Tring. It belongs to everyone and that’s why it should be preserved. As London becomes more congested, I hope people will continue to pile out of Tring station every weekend to walk in the Chilterns and enjoy our beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Perhaps a more serious problem is that the new developments will be contiguous with the AONB. Looking down from the hills surrounding Tring the view will be of a housing estate rather than beautiful countryside.</p> <p>If there should be development around Tring, it should be restricted to within existing boundaries and existing hedgerows fully maintained. I appreciate that the plan recommends this. Wildlife corridors should be created where possible and maintained if existing. Marshcroft Lane is a haven for wildlife and needs to be protected.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13078
<b>Person ID</b>	1270020
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Mark Lawson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(GFRA response)
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13111
<b>Person ID</b>	1264860
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted & Tring Developments The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13127
<b>Person ID</b>	1270061
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Berkhamsted & Tring Developments The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13148
<b>Person ID</b>	1270066
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Amanda Cole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p>

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13156

**Person ID** 1270068

**Full Name** Ms Francesca Greenoak

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** I am part of a subgroup of Tring in Transition and have studied their detailed reply to your Development Plan. I fully agree with their response and rather than reiterate their points I would like you to take this letter as my formal personal endorsement of the **Tring in Transition** response.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13190

**Person ID** 1142304

**Full Name** Mrs Fiona Ullman

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. My name was not included in the GFRA response because I joined the GFRA after the response was finalised and submitted.</i>  <i>To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13191
<b>Person ID</b>	1270122
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Ullman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. My name was not included in the GFRA response because I joined the GFRA after the response was finalised and submitted.</i>  <i>To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13192



<b>Person ID</b>	1265053
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom MacLean
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13193
<b>Person ID</b>	1270126
<b>Full Name</b>	Hannah Taylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.</i>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS13220
<b>Person ID</b>	1270128
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Salway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land. The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13251
<b>Person ID</b>	1270147
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Rhian Windridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I live in Tring and have been dismayed to read the Local Plan proposals for the whole of Dacorum, but in particular for Tring. The huge number of houses and the re zoning of Green Belt land to achieve this is irresponsible and I object on the firmest terms to this proposal. The strategy is woefully disconnected, with "lip service" paid to sustainability, something

which should be our primary concern, as the proposals for 55% more homes in the town built on green field sites would be in direct contradiction of these objectives. More homes, unsustainable levels of traffic & infrastructure demand in our town, more pollution/higher carbon footprint, fewer trees, less green space, reduced habitat for species and a strategy which considers housing development as the primary marker of "success" is frankly shocking and depressing to read. I am dismayed to see huge areas of important recreational green belt being changed to housing, which will also completely change (for the worse) the culture of the town, negatively impacting the entry points (which is a distinctive, historic market town). This cultural heritage will be eroded and replaced with 'typical' homes built by national house builders (poorly designed and constructed at this scale) and this will be a permanent and irreversible detriment to the town and it's current residents. I do not disagree with the general location of new housing, and am aware that some new homes need to be provided, but the huge number of 2700 new homes is excessive and out of proportion with the size of the town (and the data this need is based on is questionable).

I fully endorse the Green Party's views on the plan which I have pasted below.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13257

**Person ID** 1270148

**Full Name** Mr Carl Blackwell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green

Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13258

**Person ID** 1270148

**Full Name** Mr Carl Blackwell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly

in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13275

**Person ID**

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of Tring I am greatly concerned by your poorly planned Housing Plan.

It simultaneously wastes resources, damages beautiful countryside and fails to make appropriate investment to support the growth.

As it neither allows for local jobs nor support for the strain to the commuting population it serves no purpose for the people you are expected to support.

I strenuously urge you to ...

- 1 halt the Local Consultation Plan
- 2 Redraw the plan based on the recent housing densities achieved; and
- 3 Demand that housing targets are based on up-to-date estimates.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13282
<b>Person ID</b>	1270157
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Claire Laing
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13300
<b>Person ID</b>	1270182
<b>Full Name</b>	Emma Goddard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamsted for 37 years and having now moved to Tring this year. I strongly oppose the south Berkhamsted and Tring development on green belt land. Not only because of the loss of beautiful land that makes our towns the wonderful places they are to live but also having grown up and in Berkhamsted and now raising my own family I have seen a real deterioration in the schools and medical facilities over the recent years.</p> <p>Also the current social housing stock is poorly maintained and so much could be done to improve on them before even considering building more.</p> <p>Particularly Kingsley Walk/Rosebery Way areas of Tring. They are tired, unloved in many areas and really could do with some TLC.</p> <p>I think the development as it stands is detrimental for many, many reasons.</p> <p>I do however feel that affordable housing needs to be developed and that the plans can be revised to consider the points I have raised.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13311
<b>Person ID</b>	1250019
<b>Full Name</b>	Cllr Nick Hollinghurst

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	And Tring in particular is being asked to provide an unreasonable number of new dwellings – the 55% increase in houses will destroy the social fabric of the town and overwhelm its resources.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13348
<b>Person ID</b>	1270210
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Charne Salter
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	To whom it may concern,  I have recently seen the proposals for Tring and find it staggering that you feel over 2700 are in keeping with the community. I and many others are not against new builds but this number of homes will have a detrimental impact on this historic area of natural beauty. On the government website it states-



an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure

a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

I would like to know what constitutes 'sufficient land of the right types and right places?' How is Green Belt land the right type when there are Brown Field sites?

Tring is already a strong, supportive, vibrant, healthy community with already quite extensive development which at present is struggling with both Doctors, Dental surgeries and Parking all fundamental rights of Tring residents. I also noted it proposed a potential school? Is this definite or a false narrative to sway people in their decision? Also the congestion on the local roads is a major concern as there is the potential for more congestion leading to failing health by carbon emissions.

The safety and welfare of older and younger residents on road crossings by the traffic generation.

Then the environmental issue as stated above the extra use of vehicles in a relatively small area, the decimation of natural habitat for both animals and trees, I do not see how this can be adapting to climate change? Also the noise and disturbance arising from this. Not forgetting the damage HS2 already has on the environment locally, this just adds insult to injury.

Because of the reasons above I must OBJECT to this planning application.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13370

<b>Person ID</b>	924129
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Natalia McIntosh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical. The Tring and Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy is clearly developer led and offers no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist.</p> <p>(24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted and Tring sites are all basically valley sides and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13377
<b>Person ID</b>	1270224
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Heather Wignall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13442
<b>Person ID</b>	1270264
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS JANE BROWN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Building 1,800 new houses within Tr02 and Tr03 will clearly destroy the Green Belt and spoil local enjoyment of surrounding AONB which is currently characterised by long rural views and wildlife diversity.</p> <p>The infrastructure of Tring cannot be made appropriate for a 55% increase in housing without destroying the historical character of the town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13454
<b>Person ID</b>	1270265
<b>Full Name</b>	MR MAT JOHNSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to the development of proposed sites Tr03, Tr01 and Tr06</p> <p>The sheer scale of the combined developments cannot be supported by Tring and its services and infrastructure.</p> <p>It will not only destroy the beautiful landscape around the town but it will create an over-populated once market town that cannot function adequately under the strain of so many additional residents.</p> <p>Schools are already over-subscribed in Tring, Doctors surgeries cannot cope as it stands with the level of patients as people already wait weeks for appointments. The train station and more specifically its car park are already no longer fit for purpose due to the continual increase in demand.</p>

The main entrance to the town will become nothing more than a overpriced housing estate ruining the unique character of this historic market town forever.

Somewhat stating the obvious but with so many new houses come so many additional cars to the roads and the various issues that causes for our children's safety and health.

As these developments take out huge chunks of the countryside and paths people will also lose the ability to exercise locally forcing more cars on to the roads as they seek new opportunities to exercise outdoors.

If 2020/21 has taught us one thing its to respect and cherish the priceless ability to exercise in the fresh air.

People move to Tring for many reasons but these proposals loosely termed a development plan but what are in fact a massacre of cherished homes and business will effectively crush the life out of Tring for future generations.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13472

**Person ID** 1270266

**Full Name** VANDA EMERY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

If you ask the wrong questions you get the wrong answers . . .

I will only comment in detail on Tring plans as that is where I live. There is probable some need for a few self build plots and terracy of council housing (in blocks of 5 or 10) in and around tring. The current proposes are excessive and unnecessary. What is needed in and around tring is more horticultural food production (for climate adaption and resilience).

Tring has lost almost all of its orchards over the past 100 years. If the Local plan was part of a "sustainability strategy" as it should be, then it would be allocating agricultural land for horticultural production.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13496

**Person ID** 1270275

**Full Name** RICHARD ONSLOW

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I find it difficult to believe that any considered plan could possibly come to the conclusion that it is reasonable to increase a town like Tring by such a huge scale. Tring is a special, attractive town in a picturesque area and the special qualities it has now would be destroyed for ever.

Even the most cursory glance at the proposed plan would make one question the scale of the expansion.

I notice the local plan objectives include 'ensuring an attractive and valued built and historic environment'. Expansion of this scale will clearly defeat this objective.

Large scale development would just lead to huge housing estates built by the usual companies with their usual boring layouts of closely spaced box-like detached houses with two and a half floors, dormers and mock georgian windows. The provision for affordable houses would be poorly designed blocks. We would certainly not be able to rely on the planners to protect the interests of new and existing residents.

The additional traffic coming into town centre would lead to terrible congestion in the narrow streets. The high street alone would not be able to cope and diversions would lead to terrible problems in the surrounding streets.

Any rose-tinted thoughts that future residents would walk, cycle or use provided mini-buses are delusional. It would not happen.

All existing open space in the town centre would be taken up by parking, probably multi storey, which would destroy the character of the town.

I notice the plan is to 'provide additional retail floor space in... Tring town centre' Where ? - other than developments of many stories with parking on the lower levels on places like the market carpark , the auction site and the fire station. Clearly this will be completely out of scale with the existing buildings and would still not be sufficient for a 55% increase. I request that this plan is not submitted to the government but re-planned to give proper consideration to the people who live in the areas affected

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13513

**Person ID** 1270285

**Full Name** MARTIN WELLER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13530
<b>Person ID</b>	869243
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Michelle Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I fully support the GFRA response and therefore would like this to be documented as part of Dacorum's Local Plan consultation.  Please duplicate the GFRA representation against my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13531
<b>Person ID</b>	1270292
<b>Full Name</b>	Phil Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I fully support the GFRA response and therefore would like this to be documented as part of Dacorum's Local Plan consultation.  Please duplicate the GFRA representation against my name.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13553
<b>Person ID</b>	1260521
<b>Full Name</b>	Steve Ritchie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p>

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Tring image.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13596
<b>Person ID</b>	1264643
<b>Full Name</b>	Rich Abslom
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The proposed increase in housing numbers (over 2700) are not justifiable for Tring.</li> <li>2 Green Belt land has been given up far too easily for development, instead of using supportable evidence to push back on the government.</li> <li>3 The plan is not nearly explicit or proactive enough in improving the local natural environment, and in general, lacks vision for the future of Tring.</li> </ol> <p>I recognise that Dacorum has significant challenges to address in the Local Plan. However, I have a number of very serious concerns about what is proposed.</p>

There are significant gaps, errors, flawed assumptions and also inconsistencies with stated objectives. The proposed increase in housing for Tring is far in excess of national guidelines for 'sustainable development' and assurances that this will not have a negative impact are both vague and lacking in vision. The Plan fails to set out explicit and proactive measures to mitigate the loss of Green Belt and to actively improve the environment. It also fails to define standards that are ambitious or definitive enough to shape developments appropriate for how we will live and work in the mid-21st century. In contradiction to its own stated goals, it neither defines nor attempts to build upon what is distinctive about Tring and its surroundings.

The overarching goals of the Local Plan cannot be achieved by small incremental changes to how development has occurred in Dacorum over the last 50 years. Meeting the latest national and Hertfordshire position on environmental sustainability, wildlife corridors and green spaces alone will require specific, planned and proactive interventions. These are lacking in the Plan as it stands. And all new developments should be held to the highest possible standards for energy efficient construction and use. Again, the Plan is lacking in this regard.

The following is a summary of my key concerns:

- 1 A very high percentage of expansion at Tring is proposed to be on Green Belt land and there is a strong case that any developments on former Green Belt land should be held to the highest possible environmentally friendly, sustainability and energy efficiency standards. Explicit provision should be made for this – if we want distinctive, exemplar development this must be mandated. In addition, the NPPF also calls for 'for compensatory improvements to be made to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land' and this must also be explicit with minimum 10% net gain. This is not at present explicitly addressed and is a significant point of non-compliance.
- 1 The proposed growth of over 2700 new homes is not compliant with the heart of NPPF guidance for 'sustainable development'. It is proportionately by far the largest urban growth across Dacorum in a location that is arguably least well suited for it. It is significantly above the evidence-based proportion for Tring based on population growth through the Plan period as amended by the Government's 'affordability' formula (evidenced in the September 2020 SW Herts Local Housing document).

Even if the numbers decrease significantly after recently announced Government changes there is no information in the Plan about prioritisation for reduced numbers (this needs to be made public) and it is likely the essence of the plan will remain much the same. Therefore, the following concerns remain valid:

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13600
<b>Person ID</b>	1264643
<b>Full Name</b>	Rich Abslom
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 Public transport goals are aspirational only and there is nothing in the Plan that convincingly addresses transport between Tring Station and the town centre or around the new developments, or which supports modern, novel solutions.</p> <p>1 Net carbon neutrality is an essential target and new developments present an ideal opportunity to meet the highest standards. We note DBC policy of 2020 is to be zero carbon by 2030. The Plan makes several references to 'exemplar' development but falls short of explicitly defining standards for energy efficiency (through building standards) and the inclusion of extensive local energy capture (e.g., via solar) etc. The Plan does not set the bar high enough with respect to these at present.</p> <p>1 Tring is flanked on two sides by Buckinghamshire and traffic, town centre use, schooling and employment patterns are influenced very strongly by this. There is no reference to liaison with Bucks in the plan. We are concerned that conclusions about the locations of employment, retail and recreational sites are flawed in places and generally sub-optimised as a result. The same is also true when looking at environmental considerations.</p> <p>1 A key and important goal, first built into the Issues and Options (2017) Plan, is for the Local Plan and developments to reflect local distinctiveness. There is no evidence that Tring's distinctive character (in its history, town economy,</p>

unique location, etc.) has been defined, and there is therefore no associated vision; this presents an unacceptably high risk of generic, unsympathetic development.

The Plan, for reasons that are not clear, conveys a message that growth far in excess of that necessary, along with the significant loss of Green Belt, is a fait accompli. This is in stark contrast to previous versions of the Plan and is not aligned with the clear wishes of the vast majority of the Borough's population.

The real reasons for the excessively high housing growth numbers in the Plan are not explicit – especially for Tring where the relative increase in almost three times higher than the next most impacted town (and this in an area which, even according to presented evidence, is least well suited to such an increase in terms of adverse impact on the environment).

The proposed numbers are already in excess of that required by the Government.

Overall, the irreparable damage that will be done to the Green Belt and the surrounding area of Tring and beyond are antiquated and not in line with building a sustainable and green future for my children. The vast majority of Tring resident's do not want to this development to proceed, the Borough should reconsider and redevelop it's plan in the interest of its electorate.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13611

**Person ID** 1270319

**Full Name** Ms Nicola Withers

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13626

**Person ID** 1145871

**Full Name** Mr Gareth Morris

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13635

**Person ID** 1270342

**Full Name** YVONNE CORNES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

As a Tring resident living in the Grove area, I strongly object to the plans to develop on greenbelt land for housing and schools in Tring. Also for the plans to develop on the site of the town centre carpark.  
 Looking at the developments in the other local towns, Tring is being disproportionately affected with a 55% population growth. The town infrastructure is too small to cope with the additional housing.  
 The character of our market town will be sacrificed and the local wildlife would be affected very badly with the loss of the beautiful countryside on our doorsteps.  
 I seriously believe that the extent of these developments should be re-visited and re-assessed.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13639

**Person ID** 1270343

**Full Name** KEITH DELDERFIELD

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I strongly object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of houses within Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13661
<b>Person ID</b>	1259288
<b>Full Name</b>	Maria de Farago Botella
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Delivery Strategies for Tring</p> <p>The amount of housing and the potential area affected in Tring is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land. The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p> <p>In my view the whole plan should be thought again for Tring and elsewhere, to assess if the demand is that high under the current situation. Many people will be working from home since COVID-19 pandemic and, also, Brexit has shown a significant reduction of people coming from Europe and/or Europeans living the UK due to Brexit, perhaps decreasing significantly the need of so much housing.</p> <p>It is particularly worrying the incredible impact to the Chilterns and the AONB that so much housing will create to the natural environment and ecosystems. The creation of new developments should be translated into more protection of natural environment, significant re-wilding to guarantee environmental sustainability and decarbonisation.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13711
<b>Person ID</b>	1263002
<b>Full Name</b>	Rhona Denness
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing growth to Tring (55%) in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum within the plan period.

The Draft plan has failed to show the exceptional evidence required to justify the use of Green Belt land for housing in Tring (i.e proposed allocation of sites Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03). Significant and irreversible harm would be caused to the openness of Green Belt and AONB and to the biodiversity within it. The Council has not shown that this harm is balanced by collective benefits and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft polices SP23 and Sp24 on this basis.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr01, Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

The overarching strategy for development in Dacorum is for developments to be distinctive to the local settlement and to protect and enhance the historical environment. There is little evidence that this strategy has been applied to proposed developments in Tring.

NPPF requires that development on Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces – there is no evidence that this has been adequately considered and only limited consideration of the impact on green spaces around Tring. This has only been considered in relation to NT Ashridge (Beechwood SAC), and not regarding the key ‘honey pots’ of Tring Park, Stubbings Wood, our local Beechwood SAC, or College Lake.

Throughout the Plan there is confusion between what constitutes green, open or wildlife spaces and/or corridors and lack of explicit requirements around wildlife corridors, hedgerows and buffer zones (DBC Urban Nature Study maps; Tring. Herts Biological Records Centre 2005/6).

The Plan should be explicit in requiring developers to use the highest standards for renewable energy, building energy efficiency standards, public transport and biodiversity.

I strongly disagree with the idea that the existing people of Tring will gain incrementally greater benefit from larger and larger developments. There is no justification or supporting evidence for this within the Plan.

**Included files****Title** Tring Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS13713**Person ID** 1263002**Full Name** Rhona Denness**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><i>Infrastructure</i></p> <p>The vision within the Local Plan of thousands of new homes being added to perimeters of Tring (and Berkhamsted) and using Green Belt land is not backed up with adequate assessment of the pressures on water supplies, traffic, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements). There is little sustainable about the construction nor preserving of our heritage about this plan.</p> <p>Tring is bounded on two sides by Buckinghamshire. Their plans will impact hugely on employment, traffic, local land use etc. It's very important as the cross boundary impacts of changes in infrastructure are immense. Plans could certainly change in response, for example there is lots of warehousing very local along the A41 and its very unclear that more is needed within Tring itself.</p> <p>The wish to look at increasing bus routes and numbers may be one way to ease some of large increase in traffic that this plan would create but a clear commitment is needed for this. Sustainable modern transport connections are mentioned but concrete requirements not given. Public transport must be greatly improved both to connect new homes to their town centres but also to reduce traffic congestion on the roads which cannot be widened.</p> <p>Well connected and maintained dedicated cycle routes throughout our towns must be implemented along with secure bike storage. Recreational corridors should be incorporated within new built-up areas to promote cycling and pedestrian access through the development and provide connectivity with the existing town and the countryside boundaries. These routes should not be limited to narrow, dark alleyways but should be several metres wide with natural vegetation to make travelling pleasantly airy and to support bio-diversity.</p> <p>The plan suggests that 3 new schools are needed within Tring because of the increase in housing. However the plan also seems to suggest the reverse has taken place - that a secondary school within Tring is desired and therefore it should be paid for/justified by building lots of houses! The idea for two further primary schools and as secondary is based on the premise of the large number of houses and isn't likely to be necessary, unless far more evidence is given for this requirement.</p> <p>New roads in the area will hugely increase congestion, pollution and impact on biodiversity. They would adversely affect the wellbeing and quality of life of both human and wildlife populations.</p> <p>Building a new supermarket near to the existing Tescos in Tring will not offer local people what they need and will add to the congestion and pollution in the area. The development of the existing markets within Tring offer employment opportunities to locals, and a more sustainable model for local food and produce.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13715
<b>Person ID</b>	1263002
<b>Full Name</b>	Rhona Denness
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I do not believe that a second supermarket close to the current Tescos would be of any benefit to residents of Tring and would add to congestion and pollution across Tring and villages around it. I agree with Tring in Transition that this would be better sited nearer to Bulbourne to provide better access for residents in that part of Tring.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13726
<b>Person ID</b>	223941
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Cathy Davidson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13727

**Person ID** 223941

**Full Name** Mrs Cathy Davidson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given

to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13745

**Person ID** 1270368

**Full Name** Mr Charlie Laing

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13753

**Person ID** 1270370

**Full Name** Mrs Norma Rickler

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Commenting on plans for Tring:

Tring is a market town and, by building the proposed number of new houses, Tring will lose its fundamental character and become yet another sprawling, developer-led town. New housing should be restricted to within existing field boundaries. Tring is already a busy town – increasing the population by half as many again, will result in far too much local traffic, both personal and business.

Tring has ancient hedgerows and trees, and the countryside, wildlife and environment will all be affected by this development. Linked wildlife corridors need to be implemented when any new builds take place.

I've been a Tring resident for 33 years. I was born in London, and lived in several towns before moving to Tring in 1987. I commuted to London for work for a number of years. Over the years, as Tring became a more popular place to live, it has been obvious how much busier the town has become and the increase in local traffic from when I first lived here. I cannot begin to imagine how much worse it will become if the population is increased by more than half again.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13804
<b>Person ID</b>	1163978
<b>Full Name</b>	John Wignall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated</p>



with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13877

**Person ID** 1270388

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs David & Emma Robertson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such

a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13902

**Person ID** 1264756

**Full Name** Kathryn Salway

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two-storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlinked and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two

towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13904

**Person ID** 1264756

**Full Name** Kathryn Salway

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13924

**Person ID** 1270392

**Full Name** Ms Anna Skingley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13992
<b>Person ID</b>	1270412
<b>Full Name</b>	James Mullins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(7) Housing Strategy is a crucial section. It gives more detail of where homes are to be located. I have serious concerns about the allocation and how the numbers have been calculated and a missed opportunity to avoid Green Belt development at Berkhamsted and Tring. The Housing Strategy is fuelled by faulty vision, settlement hierarchy, unjustified housing target and exacerbated by flawed handling of windfall projections, thus failing to maximise growth in urban areas at the expense of Green Belt. Also fail to take into account post-pandemic working practices.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14048
<b>Person ID</b>	1264962
<b>Full Name</b>	Courtney Culverhouse
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Support needs to be provided to the town centres/high streets and I would like to see support/incentives for restaurants, cafes and shops to come to Tring as so much has closed over the last year and there won't be anywhere near enough restaurants etc. to accommodate all the new residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14057
<b>Person ID</b>	1264962

<b>Full Name</b>	Courtney Culverhouse
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring</p> <p>Tring will see a 55% increase in houses which will be built almost entirely on green belt land. The character of the local town will be changed forever. Inadequate thought to the pressures on water supplies, water waste, traffic needs, medical facilities, education, recreation, recycling centres and employment needs (to name but a few crucial infrastructure requirements) have been made. It seems a huge number of houses will simply be added to the town. We are particularly concerned with the developments being proposed on the East of Tring which seem to have poor connectivity to the town.</p> <p>Issues specific to Tring include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The High Street is very narrow and at points dangerous to pedestrians and cannot accommodate double the amount of Air quality on the High Street is also very poor</li> </ul> <p>with schools close by. There is often a build up of traffic due to lorries/vans (understandably) making drop offs to the shops and businesses on the High Street and as soon as this happens, a long traffic queue forms. This will be even worse with the 55% increase in houses proposed!! The town simply cannot accommodate and support this number of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the loss of local business hubs such as Akeman Business Park there is a lack of local business space in the town centre to accommodate a doubling in size of the local population.</li> <li>Tring has no recycling centre and already desperately requires one. Fly tipping is increasing due to lack of local</li> <li>Tring Station has poor public transport connectivity and inadequate parking. Buses are infrequent, unreliable, expensive and only operate during certain times. Cycle paths are poorly maintained and dangerous with cars given priority. Sustainable connectivity to the station would need to be greatly improved to accommodate a doubling of the town's size and should be in the Local</li> <li>Tring has lost all its banks and other valuable local amenities, many of which have been converted to residential properties, already the local post office is struggling to cope with</li> </ul>

- Tring will lose a huge amount of its valuable green belt. We call for every acre of green belt which is developed a further two acres is rewilded with public access. Such rewilded sites must be protected for future generations and located within easy access of the new

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14071
<b>Person ID</b>	1270477
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN KILPATRICK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	HARDINGS WOOD TRUST
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to strongly support all the comments and proposals set out in the detailed response that you have received from the 'Tring in Transition' group,
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14082
<b>Person ID</b>	864905
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Vicky Butterworth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Am opposed to the development of proposed sites Tr01,Tr02, Tr03, Tr04, Tr05 and TR06.

In summary, through these proposals, irreparable harm would be done to the unique character of the historic market town – which must be preserved for current and future generations.

My primary objections to the proposals are as follows:

The sheer size of the proposed development in Tr01 - Tr06: This will radically alter all that makes Tring a unique, beautiful and cohesive community. I fully recognise that new housing is required in the country, but to increase Tring's size by 50% is wholly disproportionate (not least when compared to the proposed development in nearby towns e.g. Berkhamsted) and unnecessary given housing developments could be spread over a greater number of nearby towns. There is no reason why Tring should take such a massive hit. The size of the development alone will damage the very heart of the community and turn Tring into urban sprawl. No provision is made in the plans to protect Tring's identity and individual character.

Not suitable given station a mile out of town: The location of the proposed developments means the majority of households commuting into London will need to drive to the station, in the absence of flexible and effective alternative transport links which simply don't exist today and for which there is no clear plan going forward. This will add significant congestion to the already congested roads at peak times. Traffic coming from Bulbourne Road will add a substantial volume of traffic to Grove Road which is already very busy during the beginning and end of the school day because Grove Road Primary school is located along that road.

Parking at the station: Absolutely no provision has been made for parking at the station. As it is, there is no parking from 7.30am onwards during the week and the situation is unsustainable. A shuttle bus will not adequately deal with the issue; we urgently need more parking as well as a fully worked through plan for flexible and effective alternative transport links.

No provision for wider amenities: There is a mention of new schools and a possible community centre, but there is no mention of other amenities such as doctors, green open space for walks and sports activities, village halls and cycle trails for families to enjoy. It is absolutely essential a full plan is made for a broad range of amenities. Tring is stretched as it is in terms of the amenities on offer.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14085



<b>Person ID</b>	864903
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andy Butterworth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>am opposed to the development of proposed sites Tr01,Tr02, Tr03, Tr04, Tr05 and TR06.</p> <p>In summary, through these proposals, irreparable harm would be done to the unique character of the historic market town – which must be preserved for current and future generations.</p> <p>My primary objections to the proposals are as follows:</p> <p>The sheer size of the proposed development in Tr01 - Tr06: This will radically alter all that makes Tring a unique, beautiful and cohesive community. I fully recognise that new housing is required in the country, but to increase Tring's size by 50% is wholly disproportionate (not least when compared to the proposed development in nearby towns e.g. Berkhamsted) and unnecessary given housing developments could be spread over a greater number of nearby towns. There is no reason why Tring should take such a massive hit. The size of the development alone will damage the very heart of the community and turn Tring into urban sprawl. No provision is made in the plans to protect Tring's identity and individual character.</p> <p>Not suitable given station a mile out of town: The location of the proposed developments means the majority of households commuting into London will need to drive to the station, in the absence of flexible and effective alternative transport links which simply don't exist today and for which there is no clear plan going forward. This will add significant congestion to the already congested roads at peak times. Traffic coming from Bulbourne Road will add a substantial volume of traffic to Grove Road which is already very busy during the beginning and end of the school day because Grove Road Primary school is located along that road.</p>

Parking at the station: Absolutely no provision has been made for parking at the station. As it is, there is no parking from 7.30am onwards during the week and the situation is unsustainable. A shuttle bus will not adequately deal with the issue; we urgently need more parking as well as a fully worked through plan for flexible and effective alternative transport links.

No provision for wider amenities: There is a mention of new schools and a possible community centre, but there is no mention of other amenities such as doctors, green open space for walks and sports activities, village halls and cycle trails for families to enjoy. It is absolutely essential a full plan is made for a broad range of amenities. Tring is stretched as it is in terms of the amenities on offer.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14090

**Person ID** 1261168

**Full Name** Pat Whiteman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The figures provided by DBC for required growth are inconsistent with the Government requirements and they fail to take into account the Government's recently revised policy focus on urban regeneration in the North and Midlands and strengthening of protection for Green Belt.

The plan which proposes such a significant impact on the market town of Tring and it's surrounding countryside is woefully vague in it's detail. The proposals for Tr02 and Tr03 are excessive in their scale and will destroy Tring as a Market Town. This should not be allowed to happen on the basis of an out of date and inadequate appraisal.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14091

<b>Person ID</b>	1261168
<b>Full Name</b>	Pat Whiteman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plan for the development of 1400 homes to the east of Tring on site Tr03 is excessive and unjustified. The assurances on the sensitive nature of the proposed development are flawed and inconsistent with the plan to add a link road at the (new) edge of Tring. This will become a major thoroughfare for local and commuting traffic. The greenbelt land, which includes the Chilterns AONB, will be devastated and replaced with a car-based suburban sprawl. Any development whatsoever on site Tr03 should be rejected.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14103
<b>Person ID</b>	1163236
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter and Cathy Davidson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14121
<b>Person ID</b>	1270502
<b>Full Name</b>	LUCY BONSER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Tring plans in general</p> <p>1.A very high percentage of expansion at Tring is proposed to be on Green Belt land and I believe there is a strong case that any developments on former Green Belt land should be held to the highest possible environmentally friendly, sustainability and energy efficiency standards. Explicit provision should be made for this – if we want distinctive, exemplar development this must be mandated. In addition, the NPPF also calls for ‘for compensatory improvements to be made to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land’ and this must also be explicit with minimum 10% net gain. This is not at present explicitly addressed and is a significant point of non-compliance.</p> <p>1 The proposed growth of over 2700 new homes is not compliant with the heart of NPPF guidance for ‘sustainable development’. It is proportionately by far the largest urban growth across Dacorum in a location that is arguably least well suited for it. It is significantly above the evidence-based proportion for Tring based on population growth through the Plan period as amended by the Government’s ‘affordability’ formula (evidenced in the September 2020 SW Herts Local Housing document).</p> <p>Even if the numbers decrease significantly after recently announced Government changes there is no information in the Plan about prioritisation for reduced numbers (this needs to be made public) and it is likely the essence of the plan will remain much the same. Therefore, the following concerns remain valid:</p>

- 1 Public transport goals are aspirational only and there is nothing in the Plan that convincingly addresses transport between Tring Station and the town centre or around the new developments, or which supports modern, novel solutions.
  
- 1 Net carbon neutrality is an essential target and new developments present an ideal opportunity to meet the highest standards. We note DBC policy of 2020 is to be zero carbon by 2030. The Plan makes several references to 'exemplar' development but falls short of explicitly defining standards for energy efficiency (through building standards) and the inclusion of extensive local energy capture (e.g., via solar) etc. The Plan does not set the bar high enough with respect to these at present.
  
- 1 Tring is flanked on two sides by Buckinghamshire and traffic, town centre use, schooling and employment patterns are influenced very strongly by this. There is no reference to liaison with Bucks in the plan. We are concerned that conclusions about the locations of employment, retail and recreational sites are flawed in places and generally sub-optimised as a result. The same is also true when looking at environmental considerations.
  
- 1 A key and important goal, first built into the Issues and Options (2017) Plan, is for the Local Plan and developments to reflect local distinctiveness. There is no evidence that Tring's distinctive character (in its history, town economy, unique location, etc.) has been defined, and there is therefore no associated vision; this presents an unacceptably high risk of generic, unsympathetic development.

Overall, the plan for Tring falls short of NPPF para 147, and paras 99/100

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14129

**Person ID** 1270506

**Full Name** DAN BARNETT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. My name was not included in the GFRA response because I joined the GFRA after the response was finalised and submitted.</p> <p>To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14133
<b>Person ID</b>	1263506
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, and which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p>

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14140

**Person ID** 1270545

**Full Name** CATHERINE ROWLAND

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

I am writing on behalf of High Street Baptist Church, Tring. As a church at the centre of the community of Tring and an Eco Church, we feel compelled to respond to the current Dacorum Strategy for Growth as it significantly impacts on our community and seems to be disregarding the climate emergency as noted by the Government and our local council.

While the proposal for Tring states that it "...will not pursue an urban intensification...", in reality it builds entirely on Green Belt and surrounding countryside. Furthermore, it proposes what could amount to a 55% increase in the population.

If housing development is deemed essential, we would like to make the following points:

1. Emphasise biodiversity and protection of the environment

The Government has made a commitment that new housing developments and houses themselves should be designed to integrate space for both wildlife and people, as well as to reduce carbon emissions and minimise water storage. Tring

falls within the government- designated pollinator highways, and the Government has specified that they will be committed to creating pollinator highways, throughout the country. Building on swathes of countryside is not going to enhance wildlife. There needs to be greater consideration given to this aspect of the Plan.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-pollinator-strategy-2014-to-2024-implementation-plan>

## 2. Make the development sustainable

Despite the statement “4.2 Sustainable development is about meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs and making economic, environmental and social progress for current and future

generations” there is no insistence on addressing the environmental needs of present or future generations. Instead, there is an emphasis on carbon offsetting and retro-fitting. Neither of these address the ‘climate emergency’ which Dacorum has declared.

Furthermore, the document states: “17.19 Proposals should be designed to enable future retro fitting to meet higher energy efficiency standards and lower GHG emissions by connecting to an air source heat pump, community heat networks or other low or zero carbon sources.” This would represent a waste of both money and resources. We have the technology today and we must now build carbon neutral homes, reserving retro-fitting for the existing housing stock. The proposal is short-sighted and in no way acknowledges the climate emergency which has been accepted both locally and nationally. With the Government currently issuing green grants to enable homeowners to convert away from gas to renewable energy it is imperative that no fossil fuel energy sources should be used in these new builds.

Finally, there is no mention of the construction methods, materials or labour use – all of which should also be ethically sourced.

3. Include community meeting spaces to enable community groups and places of worship. While there is mention of some community resources and recreational spaces, there is a lack of acknowledgement of the need for community meeting spaces and places of worship. With local churches providing invaluable community resources such as pre-school activity and social activities for isolated people there should be inclusion within any new development for this provision.

### Included files

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
--------------	-------------------------

<b>ID</b>	EGS14156
-----------	----------

<b>Person ID</b>	1270547
------------------	---------

<b>Full Name</b>	Ann Lynch
------------------	-----------

### Organisation Details

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
---------------------------	--



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I strongly and respectfully want to lodge my strong opposition to the above housing plans. I understand affordable housing is a necessity in all areas for local people and I stress LOCAL. There is presently no evidence of affordable houses being built. There is an ongoing migration from London families fleeing London and the suburbs to reside within our green belt and because of the house price difference London to Tring and Berkhamsted are easily able to afford the planned development. Once again leaving local young families having to move away from their families and the towns where they have built a life, contributed and have the support of their older family members because they are unable to afford the so called “affordable” housing.</p> <p>Where is the infrastructure to accommodate the housing plans? Already local families struggle to get their children into local schools and the same schools as their siblings.</p> <p>The worry and stress this causes strains family resources and relationships. Drs surgeries are overwhelmed, dispensing chemists can’t cope and with all the planned housing surely a good reason for keeping the Tring Fire Station!!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14160
<b>Person ID</b>	1270473
<b>Full Name</b>	Anonymous DBC Local Plan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	anonymous C/O DBC
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are very concerned about the proposed expansion of Tring. Understand up to 55% including rumors that some of the key characteristics of Tring could be gone forever including the cattle market.</p> <p>We understand change is sometimes good, but this is by far too much, on a Town not designed for these numbers. All around us (Aylesbury, Berkhamsted etc) have had or is proposed to have even more expansion proposed so the whole area is having massive pressure.</p> <p>Results can be seen in many areas - facilities do not keep up with housing and the landscape is ruin for ever. Understand with net migration at 100,000s per year, year on year there must be someone for everybody to live but we need to get control and make the right decisions in many areas.</p> <p>If it was not for lock down, the roads around the whole area would be even worse.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14191
<b>Person ID</b>	1253654
<b>Full Name</b>	Jodie Bell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive</p>

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two

towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments OE almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.

The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14198

**Person ID** 1270560

**Full Name** ANNIE SIMPSON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Tring

Having looked at the plans, my concerns are, that with any substantial growth (55% increase in housing is massive) the town is not just being 'added to' it is being 'changed' into a different town. Tring is a unique and small market town that would change beyond recognition with this level of growth, particularly as the urban sprawl will be generic and not necessarily sympathetic to the town, its history and architecture. It is currently the perfect balance between town and village, whereby a trip in to town will always find you waving to friends and acquaintances but equally not everybody knows you! A perfect balance. It would be so sad to not see anybody that you knew.

The town will definitely lose it's character. Most people I know who live in Tring, love it. I think if it gets bigger this love will turn into indifference.

The impact of this growth would have a negative impact on how current residents feel about Tring. There is no way this can be appreciated by anyone outside of the town because they have no emotional connection to it.

I am also very concerned about the loss of Green Belt area. My husband and I love the fact that you only have a 15-minute walk to get into the countryside, whichever way you walk out of Tring. Easy access to nature is something we treasure. The uprooting of the fields, hedgerows and trees would be a massive loss to the wildlife and us humans.

At a time when we are all far more planet-aware, we need to protect areas of nature and not disturb the natural biodiversity. It seems irresponsible to be considering actions that will increase our carbon footprint.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14199

**Person ID** 1270386

**Full Name** Mr JAMES ALLAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** am opposed to the development of proposed site Tr01

It will destroy the beautiful landscape on the main entrance to the town, surrounded by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Irreparable harm would be done to the unique character of the historic market town – which must be preserved for current and future generations.

A new major road junction is proposed for the already totally unsuitable Cow Lane and at least two new major road junctions are proposed onto the London Road. These will cause serious environmental harm - congestion, noise, air pollution, etc - for all of Tring's residents, businesses and visitors.

These new access points are exclusively on the east and south of the proposed site, thereby limiting journey options and causing indirect journeys and congestion.

Tring is relatively traffic free - this is a much appreciated aspect of the town - and this would be lost forever if Tr01 is developed.

The public right of way across the farms is currently of enormous recreational benefit to numerous walkers {including many dog walkers}, joggers and families. If the farms are built upon, local residents in eastern Tring will be deprived of this much-loved amenity and their wellbeing will suffer. There are no suitable local alternatives

The farms are a strong wildlife link between Tring Park and Pendley Manor and contain an important Local Wildlife Site. Conservation of our local wildlife heritage is of critical importance.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14219

**Person ID** 1270581

**Full Name** MR & MRS DUNCAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14261
<b>Person ID</b>	1152075
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Wakely
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.</p> <p>This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.</p> <p>The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land.</p> <p>The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.</p>
--	--

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">14260-1.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14271
<b>Person ID</b>	1261261
<b>Full Name</b>	Matt Turton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I would like to comment on all of the proposed sites - Tr01: Dunsley Farm, Tr02: New Mill, Tr03: East of Tring, Tr04: Icknield Way, Tr05: Miswell Lane, Tr06: High Street / Brook Street. I am strongly opposed to them all. As you rightly point out in your consultation document Tring is a small characterful town in an area of outstanding natural beauty. The proposal of 2,731 new houses would have a detrimental impact on residents lives and is completely inappropriate.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the need for change, I don't believe burdening a small market town with the second highest growth in houses after Hemel can be justified. In the last 10 years Tring had already seen an increase in the number of housing developments, and I believe we have reached a point where the growth needs to be stopped.</p> <p>The sites Tr01: Dunsley Farm, Tr02: New Mill, Tr03: East of Tring, Tr04: Icknield Way are all on green belt land. With our knowledge of the environmental impact and the mass destruction of species we can't reasonably expect to justify building large housing projects on green belt land. On your environmental section on the consultation document, you commit to "helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change." To illustrate the point 2011-2020 will be the warmest decade on record, with the warmest six years all being since 2015. (<a href="https://public.wmo.int/en/media/press-release/2020-track-be-one-of-three-warmest-years-record">https://public.wmo.int/en/media/press-release/2020-track-be-one-of-three-warmest-years-record</a>). More than 40% of insect species are declining and a third are endangered. The rate of extinction is eight times faster than that of mammals, birds and reptiles. The total mass of insects is falling by a precipitous 2.5% a year, according to the best data available, suggesting they could vanish within a century. (<a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/feb/10/plummeting-insect-numbers-threaten-collapse-of-nature">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/feb/10/plummeting-insect-numbers-threaten-collapse-of-nature</a>). I can't see any part of the long consultation document which addresses the destruction of habitats for animals and insects or the destruction of hedgerows. Building 2,731 new houses in Tring is indefensible. Furthermore, on the climate change section of the Dacorum website it suggests many ways that residents can help improve the environmental quality of the borough, including buying local food. As you are planning on building new houses on vast areas of farmland your proposed development completely contradicts your environmental policy.</p> <p>In my opinion the development called Roman Park off Icknield way was a step too far and building another 2,000 plus similarly sprawling housing estates on the fields around Tring seriously negatively impacts the environment and the aesthetics of the town. I believe the additional houses and resultant population and traffic congestion would irreparably destroy this market town of nearly 1,000 years and I think future generations will look at the destruction of the town's green belt and historical character with horror and disbelief. I would urge the people responsible for these proposed</p>

housing schemes to spend some time to seriously reflect on the negative impact on their descendants and ask whether it is something that they are comfortable leaving as a legacy.

In addition to the massively inappropriate growth on such a small town, I would like to mention just a few practical concerns which make this proposal unfeasible including:

There is no capacity for additional commuters at the station. When we return to commuting after COVID-19 the car park and bike racks will be full again and the trains to London overcrowded. In my experience the station car park is full at 9am on weekdays. How will adding 1,000s more passengers to this help the current or new residents and improve their quality of life?

The High Street is unsuitable to enable this growth in population, as the main commercial throughfare in Tring the High Street is currently narrow and overcrowded for both traffic and pedestrians at peak times – particularly at the crossroads with Akeman Street and Frogmore Street.

The consultation document does not address the impact of a 2,731 new houses (and lets say at least another 9,000 people living in Tring) on these current overcrowding and congestion issues particularly as we may have to live with social distancing and possible pandemics in the future.

In addition to the parking capacity issue at the station, there won't be enough parking spaces in Tring for the new residents to use in the town centre. Tring is already congested with the serious parking problem around the Natural History Museum, Park Road, and the connecting roads such as King Street, Albert Street and Langdon Street. Additionally, on the other side of Tring the current parking and congestion issues on Miswell Lane and Dundale Road would significantly worsen if your excessive growth plans are allowed to go ahead.

How will the current GP surgeries cope with the significant increase in population?

It is not acceptable to double the size of the town, changing the very character and nature of the town that we as its inhabitants love. The plans result in an unacceptably high loss of Green Belt land, a destruction of the character of a small market town and an unsustainable drain on resources and increase in traffic congestion. Please don't allow this

to happen. I am writing this in the hope that it will change your plans. My feeling from reading your consultation document is that this, like the Roman Park development is a fait accompli. Please can you prove me wrong.

In addition to the above we are currently going through a generational defining global event which must make us address our priorities in relation to building housing stock and the use of green belt land. I know it is not just Dacorum Borough Council which is having pressure put upon it to build housing and there are a quarter of a million homes planned to be built on Green Belt land – a rise of 475% since 2013.

(<https://www.cpre.org.uk/news/pressure-on-our-green-belts-quadruples/>) Please consider that alongside this worrying destruction of our green belt, a CPRE poll of adults across the country shows that shows that two-thirds of adults think that protecting and enhancing our green spaces should be a higher priority after lockdown. This shows just how much community in Dacorum would suffer if these local patches of green are lost.

(<https://www.cpre.org.uk/news/pressure-on-our-green-belts-quadruples/>).

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14273

**Person ID** 1270592

**Full Name** SARA DARLING

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Feedback on Dacorum Strategic Local Plan concerning Tring

1. The consultation has taken place during the pandemic when people have other distractions and concerns and may not have had the opportunity to see the plans.
2. The scale of the planning, a proposed 55% increase, is completely out of proportion with the existing infrastructure, and the type of historic town.
3. The areas where the housing is planned are part of previously protected green belt and in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding natural Beauty.

4. We are facing a climate emergency which Dacorum has recognised yet this proposed development will destroy areas of natural habitat for wildlife and carbon capture and seems to directly fly in the face of promises and commitments made on the council's own website.

5. The housing does not meet the necessity to be carbon neutral and does not meet the needs of local people.

6. The effect of the pandemic on commuting habits has not been evaluated or taken into account. If commuting returned to pre pandemic levels there is not capacity for car parking at the station which is situated outside the town; the carpark, which has already been doubled in size was full by 9am. The trains leaving Euston for Berkhamsted and Tring in rush hour were full to capacity.

7. Tring has already given up green belt land for 400 homes which are currently being built and the impact of the extra population on road use, traffic through the town, GP services and schools will be considerable and seems to be unaccounted for in the plan.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14274
<b>Person ID</b>	1270629
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Bray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Sponsorship & Fundraising Tring Rugby Club
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In simple terms, the facilities we currently have at Cow Lane, Tring are too small and the funds and land available to facilitate any expansion are extremely limited. The playing and support base is largely drawn from Tring, Berkhamsted and surrounding villages but also further afield. The increase in housing and population proposed would actually be detrimental to the rugby club as we simply couldn't manage with the additional demand from the expanded population and would alienate the elements of the community we would have to turn away. The clubhouse, pitches and parking are too limited to enable expansion. While we would welcome an opportunity to cater for more players and supporters the land and facilities in their current form cannot cope.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14287
<b>Person ID</b>	1270629
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Bray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Sponsorship & Fundraising Tring Rugby Club
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted and Tring, over brownfield and urban development (contrary to NPPF), while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation for after the Plan is illogical.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14303
<b>Person ID</b>	1259141
<b>Full Name</b>	Kirsten Riemer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title**

Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS14313

**Person ID**

1270581

**Full Name**

MR & MRS DUNCAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA) has responded in full to the consultation. Our names were not included in the GFRA response because I joined the GFRA after the response was finalised and submitted.

To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the GFRA response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate GFRA's responses under my name. For completeness the GFRA response is attached.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">0485-02 Consultation Comments on Emerging Strategy - Grove Fields Residents Association.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14316
<b>Person ID</b>	1270635
<b>Full Name</b>	Catherine Bright
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p>

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14354

**Person ID** 1270641

**Full Name** WILLIAM ALLEN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** The growth of Tring on such a scale will destroy that lovely market-town community. The housing that will be built is likely to target executive commuters moving into the area and not be for the need within the Borough, as evidenced by waiting list for public housing.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14452

**Person ID** 1265051

**Full Name** Edmund Knox

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and <b>AONB</b>, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14453
<b>Person ID</b>	1265051
<b>Full Name</b>	Edmund Knox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I recommend you reassess any requirement to allocate Green Belt land outside of the settlement boundaries of Tring as per my earlier comments, it is my position that if it can be proven that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to allocate any Green Belt land outside of the settlement of Tring, further consideration should be given to the opportunities available at the Tr01 site. In the broadest of assessments against the Green Belt review and certainly in comparison to the functioning of the Green Belt of sites Tr02 and Tr03 respectively, Tr01 contributes less significantly to the Green Belt than those sites and as such should form the basis of initial consideration.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14503
<b>Person ID</b>	1270685
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jan Kerry
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green</p>

Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14513

**Person ID** 1270383

**Full Name** Mr Nigel Kerry

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14539

**Person ID** 1163978

**Full Name** John Wignall

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to

Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14571

**Person ID** 1270700

**Full Name** Mr Peter Sims

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>If you ask the wrong questions you get the wrong answers . . .</p> <p>I will only comment in detail on Tring plans as that is where I live. There is probable some need for a few self build plots and terracy of council housing (in blocks of 5 or 10) in and around tring. The current proposes are excessive and unnecessary. What is needed in and around tring is more horticultural food production (for climate adaption and resilience). Tring has lost almost all of it orchards over the past 100 years. If the Local plan was part of a "sustainbability strategy" as it should be, then it would be allocating agriclutlural land for horticultural production.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14616
<b>Person ID</b>	1259141
<b>Full Name</b>	Kirsten Riemer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14628
<b>Person ID</b>	1270729
<b>Full Name</b>	MR & MRS A HOUGHTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270728
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	MS

	KAREN GALLEY
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am concerned and object to the concentration of the delivery strategy upon Tring. The disproportionate allocation of growth - 55% is astounding and cannot but change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the rural nature of the existing settlement,</li> <li>- historical character of the market town,</li> <li>- the composition of its community</li> <li>- the openness of aspect and entry to an area of outstanding natural beauty.</li> </ul> <p>One of the most notable aspects of Tring is the balance of community in terms of spread of age. Also, the sense of community, the politeness and care shown by young to old, the attentiveness to customers in the shops. These soft attributes define community and cohesion. Given that part of the stated vision is Supporting Community Health and wellbeing and cohesion, the extent of proposed growth seems counter to supporting this.</p> <p>The vision of 'Ensuring attractive built and historic environment', by implication would include preserving. Part of Tring's attraction and appeal its openness, along with the rural and historical aspect.</p> <p>Additionally, the vision to Conserve and protect the natural environment, seems at variance to the approach being proposed when the expansion of Tring is by virtue of Green Belt / farmland release. The use of Green Belt agricultural land impacts the openness and outstanding views, of this area of natural beauty.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances are required for the release of Green Belt and these are not explicit.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14629
<b>Person ID</b>	1270729
<b>Full Name</b>	MR & MRS A HOUGHTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270728
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	MS KAREN GALLEY

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My main concern is Tring and the allocation of Green Belt land to such a large growth plan. Size of development I especially queried in section 4.</p> <p>Other considerations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt already identified as a precious commodity is even more so with the current focus under the heading of Climate Warming which covers the harm we do to our environment, and the need to protect the environment from further encroachment.</li> <li>- Emergent trends. The pandemic has currently changed our way of life and also the ways that businesses are operating. Post Covid trends are not fully known; the requirement of office space is likely to fall and this opens up the possibility of redevelopment, and the probability of an underestimate of what is available for this.</li> <li>- Should there prove to be exceptional circumstances that prevail to force the use Green belt, careful attention needs to be given to which sites are developed and the density of housing. A blend of housing which includes starter homes and, avoidance of too high density (which has been identified in sustainability papers as having a detrimental impact on the character of the area and lead to an area losing its distinctive qualities).</li> </ul> <p>Too high density and unrealistic parking allocation readily leads to creation of horrendous parking issues, air quality, light and noise pollution.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14637
<b>Person ID</b>	1270731
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS JOAN EELEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes



<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14647
<b>Person ID</b>	1265051
<b>Full Name</b>	Edmund Knox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

<p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b></p>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and <b>AONB</b>, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Tring Delivery Strategy</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS14657</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1270735</p>
<p><b>Full Name</b></p>	<p>KEITH AND LESLEY BAKER</p>
<p><b>Organisation Details</b></p>	
<p><b>Agent ID</b></p>	
<p><b>Agent Full Name</b></p>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We strongly object to the above Plan on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposal is to increase the amount of housing in Tring by 2,700 houses, a 55% Further, with reference to Page 16 "Key Developments in Tring" of the Dacorum Local Plan booklet distributed to households, it looks like the footprint of the Town is nearly to double. <u>No Town could absorb this degree of expansion and still retain its character or for its Services to be able to cope with the extra demand that that extra housing places upon it.</u></li> <li>• Looking at the Maps of the 'Satellite Towns' to Hemel Hempstead - Berkhamsted, Tring, Kings Langley, Bovington, and Markyate, <u>it is evident that Tring is the only one with this degree of unacceptable expansion.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expansion shown on the north-east of the Town between the Bulbourne Road and Station Road (Areas Tr02 and Tr03) is particularly egregious for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It is a development in the Green Belt which causes unacceptable harm and no exceptional circumstances have been given why this land should be <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty lying as it does at the base of the Chiltern Downs. It is also home to abundant wildlife species including</li> </ol> </li> <li>2 It accounts for a large part of the unacceptably high increase in the housing</li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Planners fail to recognise two very important points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 First the Government have quite rightly decided that the numbers behind this National Plan, of which this Plan forms part of, no longer makes sense. It was based on a discredited algorithm which put too much emphasis on expanding housing in the South-east and not on the regional 'evening-up' policy endorsed by the <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Up until the outbreak of Covid 19, one could fairly say that Tring was largely a Commuter Town with 1000 plus cars parked daily at Tring Station. A development that placed more houses near to the Station might have claimed some justification. Times have changed quite radically with the best estimates we have suggesting that clerical workers are likely to visit an office perhaps two times a week. In future, that office might no longer be in Central London but locally in Dacorum and the house no longer needs to be close to a commuter station. <u>This Planned development looks increasingly like yesterday's plan.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><u>For all of the above reasons, we strongly object to the Plan in its current form</u></p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14666
<b>Person ID</b>	860814
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Clare Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>A 55% growth of housing supply in Tring is proposed which is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth.</p> <p>The delivery of 1800 houses in TR02 and TR03 will cause a substantial loss of Green Belt land, causing irreversible harm to both the ecological and visual aspect of the Green Belt and the AONB. I have seen no evidence of mitigation to offset this loss.</p> <p>I therefore object to the delivery strategy for Tring. Specific points of note:</p> <p>23.140: Once again - vague and meaningless and presents a vision of the high street that is not suitable for the mid 21st century. See comments to Question 2 above regarding the vision for the High Street. What "market town attributes" are you trying to conserve?</p> <p>23.147: Link road from Bulbourne Road to London Road?? This will cross Marshcroft Lane (a quiet lane popular with walkers) and Station Road! Do you intend to destroy Pendley as well??</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23.151: You could provide a new footpath / cycle path to the Station and people will still use their car to get to the station. 2km is the minimum from the High Street and most live much further away. You are delusional if you think that you can implement a policy to encourage people to walk or cycle - they won't.</li> </ul>

23.152 : Incorrect. The road network in Tring has multiple congestion points across the town. It is simply not true that these points are limited to the areas indicated.

23.156: This conflicts with Section 23.147 which suggests a link road to London Road. Problem still arises that it crosses Marshcroft Lane.

23.158: See my comment on 23.151 above.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14681

**Person ID** 1270739

**Full Name** HELEN OSBORNE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14691

**Person ID** 1270740

**Full Name** JOHN OSBORNE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive

harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14701
<b>Person ID</b>	1270752
<b>Full Name</b>	DOUGLAS CANNON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring .</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green</p>

Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14713

**Person ID** 1270753

**Full Name** ANNE PIKE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the...55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth if population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.



There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 135 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14726

**Person ID** 1259966

**Full Name** Trevor Sawyer

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

So why has Tring been singled out for massive over development, which includes a disproportionate Green Belt release, when compared with ALL other towns in Dacorum? is it because we have outstanding facilities compared with the others? No. Is it because we have better communications than the others with more than 5,000 population? No. is it

because we have better shopping? No. is it because we are out on a limb, about as far as you can get in the Borough and County from the seats of power? Probably: there are many examples around the country where local authorities 'dump' their major housing numbers as far from their key locations as possible.

The facts are this, expressed as a percentage of the existing population Tring is expected to absorb an additional (assuming The local UK National Census Data of an average 2.5 persons per household) - 57% population, 46% on Green Belt land alone. The numbers for the other locations in the report are: Berkhamsted 25% and 20% respectively: Hemel 27% and 3.9%: Kings Langley 13.7% and 7.25%: Bovington 12% and 7.5%: Markyate 16.7% and 12%. I ask again, why is Tring being singled out for this excessive over-development? It can only be because of our location at the far extreme of the Dacorum. More than double the population growth of the others (2.3X Berkhamsted and 2.1X Hemel) and 11.5X that on Green Belt in Hemel

The production levels proposed in the earlier 'full' Dacorum Planners report proposals {that seem to have now been cast in tablets of stone, despite being labelled for consultation) propose the annual rate of housebuilding to be as follows: 2025/6 90 completions from 2 major releases sites: 26/7 120 from 2 sites: 27/8 170 from 3: 28/9 220 from 3: 29/30 245 from 3: 30/1 240 from 3: 31/2 310 from 3: 32/3 200 from 2: 33/4 175 from 1: 34/5 175 from 1: 35/6 125 from 1: 36/7 125 from 1: 37/8 100 from 1.

Therefore, for 8 years from 2026, we will have major construction works in 2/3 different locations around Tring with all the safety issues that come with heavy transport rattling around our narrow roads, potentially 100's of 'imported' construction workers arriving by car every day, and the inevitable road closures required for service works: what a prospect for our quiet, historic Market Town. Should our school-children and the more mature amongst us who may have mobility issues, be subjected to this level of disruption for such a long period? There are clearly safety issues around so much additional traffic and the associated pollution **that** comes with it.

The plan process started in 2017 and is 'flagged' **as a** 'consultation document for this year 2021. However, looking through this report, many hundreds of pages long, there are key elements/stats (some already noted above) that suggest that this is not for consulting, but a decision document .that is just waiting a formal 'nod' from the politicians. Much of this report is cut & paste waffle from other National documents: there is a dearth of real local consideration. There are also in my view, a number of out-of-date assumptions and inaccuracies in the core information, as well as conflicting statements about conserving the character of the area, its' status as an AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and preserving the views from and to the Chilterns at the same time as commissioning mass destruction of all of the above and Green Belt land by bulldozer.

Given that the national population growth numbers were downgraded in 2018, has this been taken into consideration? Further, have the inevitable reductions in population growth due to Brexit and Covid also played a part: will we need so many new homes in the future? Also a Brexit factor is that we should be preserving our precious high quality farming land for food production, not concreting over it. As announced late last year, Central Government are to review the amount of development in the countryside, meaning that the current proposals should be at best reviewed and held 'till there are clearer policy decisions.

Another inaccuracy in the report assumptions is affordability. It suggests that there is close to a +50% difference in house prices between Berkhamsted and Tring, suggesting that Tring is a much more affordable area. Berkhamsted has many more larger homes than does Tring, therefore distorting the average house prices upwards. The true comparison, based on the proposed 'mix' of house sizes for the developments means that a true comparison would be for the traditional 3 bed semi/terraced, which shows that the price of these properties in both towns are far closer, in some instances equal. So, if the reason for putting so many new homes in Tring is one of affordability, it is a totally false argument.

Given that there may be a case for additional housing in Tring, why does there have to be so much destruction of Green Belt land, given that we are on the edge of the Chiltern's and an AONB. This is particularly true of Dunsley Farm which is an active dairy operation that has been around for many, many years. This land is 'lightly' used and is therefore an important resource for wildlife. It is not 'intensively' farmed, unlikely to be contaminated by chemicals and to my personal knowledge, not ploughed for at least two decades, probably much longer. It also has a very well established layout of fields, with equally well established boundary hedges. These again are only lightly maintained and therefore, very important to wildlife, as we see and hear on a regular basis: in fact at dusk we have seen bats flying between roosts. Research of ancient maps, indicate that the field layout for Dunsley, looks the same/similar to that of 200 years ago and probably longer, so it is very much part of the Towns' history and heritage.

Unlike the other proposed sites, there is ready public access to the land via a footpath in use every day and often all day. The other sites seem to have/had more intensive arable uses and without so much divisional hedging, therefore unlikely to have the same wildlife/amenity value as Dunsley. Its' aesthetic amenity value also extends way beyond the existing boundaries: it is next to the main entrance to our historic Market Town and in many ways establishes the whole definition of Tring as a place to live: a country Market Town, not an urbanised extension to Heme! or Aylesbury. This is what we and our visitors see as the first impression of Tring, nestling on the edge of the Chilterns an area of AONB. To develop Dunsley would have a significant visual and amenity impact not only on the Town, but as it is viewed from much further afield. So why is Dunsley Farm being promoted as a development site when there is so much against it? Simple, it is the 'soft option': being owned by Herts County Council, they have the ability as owners to promote it through the planning process and effectively grant themselves planning permission. But, being the easy option, does not make it the right one. If we accept that there needs to be housing in Tring on Green Belt land (which I believe much of the current population don't) starting with one larger site, say Station Road/Grove Farm, would provide a complete town edge settlement, provide the housing numbers so much desired by the Herts/Dacorum and reduce the disruptive impact on the Town and the visual impact from the approach to Tring and from further afield.

Traffic pollution to both homes and schools from the A41 would be nil (unlike Dunsley) and it would provide valuable time to re-assess the demand for homes following the disruption of Covid and Brexit on the population statistics. Even central Government has seen the error of forcing the destruction of much loved Green Belt land, in our already crowded country, so why are Dacorum and Herts continuing to press this very unpopular measure? Is this just another unimaginative 'formulaic' approach by the planners to squeeze new developments in between the Town and by-pass - see the similar proposals for Berkhamsted too.

The development of Ounsley Farm will change Tring forever and have a far greater negative impact than anything that has taken place since the Market Charter was granted 700 years ago. Either stop this 'soft option' by Herts CC now, or at least delay it until there is better long term information available.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14765

**Person ID** 1270760

**Full Name** LQ Estates

**Organisation Details** LQ Estates

**Agent ID** 1270759

**Agent Full Name** Miss  
Hanna  
Mawson

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The Key Development in Tring diagram identifies three main growth areas around Tring. The New Mill site is located within the largest of these growth In line with the spatial strategy, the delivery strategy states that Tring will deliver around 2,730 dwellings over the Plan period. A significant number of this (around 2,200 dwellings) will be delivered as urban extensions through the release of the Green Belt of the following strategic sites:

- East of Tring (1,400 dwellings)
- New Mill (400 dwellings)
- Dunsley Farm (400 dwellings)

This approach is supported and clearly identifies how Tring will deliver the housing allocated through the spatial

A number of key objectives for the new neighbourhoods are also identified. These include:

- create new comprehensively planned neighbourhoods as mixed use urban extensions to the south and east of the town;
- integrate new development with the existing built-up area of Tring in terms of sustainable transport connections, open space and urban grain/ morphology;
- provide significant ecological and open space buffers to the GUC and the hamlet of Bulbourne, with a connecting corridor of open space to Grove Road, and a buffer of open space along Station Road;

- take account of the Chilterns AONB setting, including long-distance views of the sites from the Chiltern Hills to the south and east in respect of the site layout, design and landscaping;
- provide and support new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and Tring Station;
- deliver a mix of market and affordable housing, new community facilities, two new primary schools and a secondary school, a new business hub, a local neighbourhood hub, and a hierarchy of open spaces;

These key objectives can be delivered through appropriate masterplanning and are discussed further in Section Eight of this representation in relation to New Mill.

Policy SP23 Delivering Growth in Tring allocates a total of six sites in the Growth Areas. Allocation Tr02 New Mill allocates the site as a major urban extension to deliver around 400 dwellings with public open space; neighbourhood centre; sports/community hub; primary school; and secondary school. This approach is supported as the two sites can be delivered independently of each other. The policy helpfully allocates what should be delivered on each site which is also supported.

Policy DP24 Delivering Growth in East Tring sets out that the urban extension to the East of Tring will come forward as a series of comprehensively planned urban extension with a Masterplan led This is broadly supported and L&Q Estates is happy to work with the Council on a comprehensive masterplan which includes the New Mill site. The Masterplan will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes. It is considered that New Mill should be covered by a single Code and L&Q Estates would wish to be closely involved in developing this. The pedestrian and cycle connections would be the main items to be dealt with comprehensively in relation to the East of Tring site. The Initial Concept Plan shows indicative pedestrian/cycle routes with the connection points informed by existing gaps in the hedgerow on this boundary. A single Design Code would allow for this standalone site to come forward early in the Plan period and assist with housing delivery in the Borough. This is discussed further in Section 8. The policy states that the masterplan-led approach will be based on the TCPA Garden City Principles. This is not objected to and it is agreed that the masterplanning process should follow good urban design principles, although not necessarily limited to Garden City Principles.

Section 24 of the Plan sets out the proposals and sites. Map 43 shows Growth Area Tr02 New Mill and provides a series of site-specific requirements. These are discussed in Section Seven and Eight of this representation with reference to the emerging Development Framework Plan for this

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14786

**Person ID** 1142710

**Full Name** Mr Chris Stoneman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are . undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, ' the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14797
<b>Person ID</b>	1270798
<b>Full Name</b>	SAYED BEL-BAROO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the '55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population'. expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14823
<b>Person ID</b>	1270804
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Jessica Field
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14832
<b>Person ID</b>	865149
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Robin Jarvis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>Developments in Tring</b></p> <p>There are a number of aspects to consider, <b>firstly</b>:</p> <p><b>Building on farmland and green belt</b></p> <p>The government has already made it clear that post Brexit there is to be a greater emphasis on producing food in the UK – this plan proposes losing a large area of good, fertile farmland.</p> <p>Following the discredited building algorithm the government has changed its policy on where houses should be built but this plan completely ignores the government’s revised building strategy</p> <p><b>Secondarily:</b></p> <p><b>Secondly Schools:</b></p> <p>The plan includes a “potential school”; this is very loose as it does not explicitly state that one will be built, neither does it state whether it is primary or secondary.</p> <p>The planners may not know that the senior school in Tring is being rebuilt and the planning instructions for the school’s capacity explicitly precludes an increase in the size of the intake cohorts which will remain at the present level.</p> <p>The plan calls for the construction of 2731 new houses. Assuming a conservative estimate of two children per house that is 5462 children to be accommodated in the existing schools. We appreciate that the age range will be spread there are still a number of places to be found. You will appreciate that using the standard figure of 2.3 children per household the number rises to 6281.</p> <p>To add to the demand for school places Aston Clinton, a village close to Tring and in the secondary school’s catchment area, is also involved in an extensive house building programme.</p> <p><b>Thirdly</b>, and possibly the most important aspect is the medical facilities:</p> <p><b>Doctors Surgeries:</b> The current Covid-19 pandemic masks the difficulties experienced in obtaining Doctors’ appointments; the number of patients is already high without adding potentially nearly 12,000 more.</p> <p><b>Hospitals:</b> The nearby town of Aylesbury is to be designated a Garden Town and the proposal is increase the size of the town considerably; they have built and are in the process of building thousands of new homes. The area is supported by Stoke Mandeville Hospital which has a finite capacity.</p> <p>The plan will overwhelm the available schools and local medical facilities.</p>

The plan is for too many houses where there are too few local jobs already and the infrastructure is not in place to support such an increase.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14833

**Person ID** 1270806

**Full Name** Diane Jarvis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Developments in Tring**

There are a number of aspects to consider, **firstly**:

**Building on farmland and green belt**

The government has already made it clear that post Brexit there is to be a greater emphasis on producing food in the UK – this plan proposes losing a large area of good, fertile farmland.

Following the discredited building algorithm the government has changed its policy on where houses should be built but this plan completely ignores the government’s revised building strategy

**Secondarily:**

**Secondly Schools:**

The plan includes a “potential school”; this is very loose as it does not explicitly state that one will be built, neither does it state whether it is primary or secondary.

The planners may not know that the senior school in Tring is being rebuilt and the planning instructions for the school’s capacity explicitly precludes an increase in the size of the intake cohorts which will remain at the present level.

The plan calls for the construction of 2731 new houses. Assuming a conservative estimate of two children per house that is 5462 children to be accommodated in the existing schools. We appreciate that the age range will be spread there

are still a number of places to be found. You will appreciate that using the standard figure of 2.3 children per household the number rises to 6281.

To add to the demand for school places Aston Clinton, a village close to Tring and in the secondary school's catchment area, is also involved in an extensive house building programme.

**Thirdly**, and possibly the most important aspect is the medical facilities:

**Doctors Surgeries:** The current Covid-19 pandemic masks the difficulties experienced in obtaining Doctors' appointments; the number of patients is already high without adding potentially nearly 12,000 more.

**Hospitals:** The nearby town of Aylesbury is to be designated a Garden Town and the proposal is increase the size of the town considerably; they have built and are in the process of building thousands of new homes. The area is supported by Stoke Mandeville Hospital which has a finite capacity.

The plan will overwhelm the available schools and local medical facilities.

The plan is for too many houses where there are too few local jobs already and the infrastructure is not in place to support such an increase.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14895

**Person ID** 1144629

**Full Name** Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Many of the comments elsewhere in the paper also are relevant to the Guiding Development policies. These comments are not repeated here.

In particular, SP20 (Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted) is not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3. SP22 (Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted) is not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3. ("*West Berkhamsted*" is essentially Northchurch, a village.)

SP23 (Delivering Growth in Tring) is likewise not agreed for the same reasons as given above in relation to SP2 and SP3.

See also Section 5 below for details of the adverse impact on the village of Northchurch and specific considerations relating to the Northchurch sites.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14926

**Person ID** 1270586

**Full Name** RACHEL CHAPMAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14932

**Person ID** 1270839

**Full Name** EMMA WELLER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14943
<b>Person ID</b>	1270840
<b>Full Name</b>	RUTH DAGGETT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>To increase the amount of housing in Tring by 55% would destroy Tring as it is now, it would become inaccessible and parking and facilities would be completely overstretched. I am not objecting to some development, it is this enormous, unbelievable increase which seems sheer vandalism. Please think again, why are there no building proposals on the canal side of Icknield Way? It could support some building if carefully planned.</p> <p>I have lived in Tring for thirty years and love my home town. Please respect its nature as a market town where residents can walk in rural surroundings around its periphery.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14969
<b>Person ID</b>	1270499
<b>Full Name</b>	Hertfordshire County Council Property
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Property Team
<b>Agent ID</b>	1263792
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Ms Claire Newbury
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Senior Associate Vincent and Gorbing
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>TRING DELIVERY STRATEGY</b></p> <p>HCC welcomes the identification of Tring as <i>'one of the most sustainable towns in the Borough'</i> acting as a hub, providing a range of services and facilities for its residents and the surrounding rural hinterland. The ESG recognises that, given its size and level of facilities and transport links, the settlement should be an important focus for meeting the Borough's</p>

development needs within this plan period. Whilst Tring has the same town centre hierarchy designation as Berkhamsted, it has roughly half the number of residents. Historically, this slower growth may be attributable to the surrounding landscape designations and unique character, however it is considered that these elements can be respected and retained, whilst delivering sustainable growth.

HCC recognises that any significant growth will need to be supported by appropriate levels of new infrastructure provision, and HCC is willing to play their part in that provision, commensurate to the level of growth that is being delivered at Dunsley Farm. It is also willing to accommodate infrastructure beyond the needs of the Dunsley Farm allocation, provided that appropriate levels of contributions are sought from the other strategic allocations within Tring to fund the necessary infrastructure in line with the level of growth being delivered on individual sites.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14978

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

We would like to be consulted on the Masterplan for these areas

The Supporting text does not seem to acknowledge that the Long Marston Brook (designated Main River) runs through Tring, close to where growth areas are proposed.

We are pleased to see that a comprehensive green (and blue) infrastructure network will be enhanced including biodiversity net gain and water management which should specifically mention flood risk.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS15020
<b>Person ID</b>	1270845
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIC LAWRANCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Policy SP23 (“Delivering Growth in Tring”) is likewise not agreed, for the same reasons as given above in relation to policies SP2 and SP3.</b>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15089
<b>Person ID</b>	1270923
<b>Full Name</b>	M J ANNING
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<u>Re Tring Development Plan</u> - I am writing to you regarding the above I acknowledge the need for more housing, and that Tring should have its share. Much of the proposal is acceptable, however I wish to make the following points regarding the Town Centre aspect of the plan.



By their very nature all town centres are congested with traffic / parking issues. The overdevelopment lies at the junction of Brook St / Mortimer Hill.

As a Tring resident of 68 years for the last 20 years I have avoided driving down Brook St as parked cars (legally) make it a single track.

Mortimer Hill at school time is congested with traffic and fleets of 52 seater coaches picking up children and hundreds of children on foot, the school is being expanded so this will only get worse.

I should ask that these points are taken into consideration

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15105

**Person ID** 1270925

**Full Name** Mrs Kathryn Salway

**Organisation Details** Extinction Rebellion Dacorum

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlinked and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

In the case of Tring, the amount of housing and the potential area affected is very significant and includes the addition of 2,731 new houses, 1 new secondary school, 2 new primary schools, and associated retail, sport and industrial developments – almost doubling the size of the town. This equates to a 55% increase in houses for Tring, mostly on Green Belt land. The proposed developments on the Green Belt, particularly in East Tring, are not connected with services or the town and will therefore have a considerable impact on the environment, air quality and GHG emissions.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15173
<b>Person ID</b>	1270993
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS MERRIL TRUEMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15183
<b>Person ID</b>	1270998
<b>Full Name</b>	PAUL HARRIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15193
<b>Person ID</b>	1142578

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Norman Brooks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>-</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15244
<b>Person ID</b>	1271085
<b>Full Name</b>	Margaret and Geoffrey Lunn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Despite our address, we are actually in Bucks so our objections to this scheme are certainly not Nimbyism.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing that our country is over populated we were astonished &amp; dismayed to discover that Dacorum Council are planning to build such a large development at the gateway to Tring. Tring has been a market town since the 14 th century &amp; this development would change the town for ever. Land is a finite source &amp; once lost it is lost for ever. Surely there are brownfield sites even in Tring that can be utilised/or smaller developments. The Aylesbury side of Tring is already under construction &amp; this should be enough for large scale building.</p> <p>As non-residents of Tring, we are not in a position to even guess if the town's present infrastructure could support hundreds more houses &amp; commercial concerns but it seems unlikely.</p> <p>The first Google entry for Tring says "Tring is a market town &amp; civil parish in the Borough of Dacorum ,Hertfordshire. It is situated in a gap passing through the Chiltern Hills, classed as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty 30 miles from London."</p> <p>How sad it would be if your planners were the ones responsible for changing the "is" to "was"</p> <p>Please think carefully before you change the whole character of this approach to the town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15246
<b>Person ID</b>	1271086
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS PATRICIA BEL-BARKO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocat[on alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, t 9t which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive haim has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15257
<b>Person ID</b>	1271088

<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WALTERS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please find enclosed my objections - views shared with a substantial number of fellow Tring residents - in response to the Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038 document.</p> <p>I wish to register, in the strongest possible terms and a maximum sense of outrage, the proposals to turn Tring from a finite market town into an urban sprawl.</p> <p>What, exactly, have we done in Tring to deserve an expansion of up to 55 per cent population with a house-building programme which would be environmental vandalism and a grotesque violation of the Green Belt?</p> <p>Why are we being singled out for this monstrous treatment?</p> <p>The scale of development outlined is indefensible, immoral and, in my submission, probably illegal in terms of the unfair and disproportionate share of the house-building burden Tring is being asked to bear.</p> <p>If I had wanted to move to a suburb of Milton Keynes, I would have bought a house there in the first place.</p> <p>Once Green Belt areas are concreted over with housing/infrastructure, they are gone forever.</p> <p>Any councillors or politicians - at parish, borough, county or parliamentary level - who vote in favour of the proposals relating to Tring as they stand will go down in history as ecological hooligans and statutory pariahs (I am inclined to use a stronger, vulgar noun but restraint has its virtues).</p>



This is not a simple case of Not In My Back Yard. If there is a shortage of housing nationwide, I accept Tring should not be immune to new bricks and mortar. But on what basis should we be expected to accept expansion way above the local and national average required? The notion is obscene.

And if **affordable** housing is the goal, why are homes on the sizeable Roman Park development currently under construction, between Icknield Way and Aylesbury Road on the town's western fringe, starting at nearly £400,000 asking price?

If more homes - not expensive homes - is the No.1 criterion, why did you grant planning permission for yet more properties way beyond the reach of first-time buyers (and qlost buyers)?

There are other factors which should compel **every** local authority to exercise extreme caution before violating Green Belt land, such as the fall-out from the Covid-19 pandemic, which has turned working from home into a new way of life for many. Does that not leave office blocks in our cities, once populated by commuters, lying empty? Does that not make countless brown-field sites ripe for redevelopment as housing, instead of vandalising semi-rural market towns like Tring?

Under no circumstances do I accept that the town where I have lived for almost 25 years should be over-developed on the preposterous scale outlined in the Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038.

This is not just a battle for Tring's soul. It is an acid test of public administration's integrity, and I shall be monitoring events in this 'consultation' process like a hawk - both personally and professionally.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15264
<b>Person ID</b>	1261209
<b>Full Name</b>	Fenella Goode
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15266
<b>Person ID</b>	1271099
<b>Full Name</b>	ANN STAFF
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>My comments relate to all sites proposed in Tring. I am sorry but no council should be allowed to just go ahead with such enormous planning schemes without detailed discussion with the smaller councils in which the proposed developments are to take place. More time needs to be spent on the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The actual need for such development after the last year which has certainly changed the need for residents to travel to a central point – ie London daily for work</li> <li>2 The wanton taking over of farms and other important green space including Green Belt</li> <li>3 The infrastructure which is already inadequate right across the board</li> <li>4 Over riding the right of residents to object by issuing all these proposals during lockdown</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15342
<b>Person ID</b>	1271220
<b>Full Name</b>	MAUREEN RUMSEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner ' that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15354

<b>Person ID</b>	1145662
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Catherine Anderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>GIVEN the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and <b>AONB</b>, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15370
<b>Person ID</b>	1149688
<b>Full Name</b>	Lynda Hobley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Infrastructure in Tring:</u> Tring currently has no banks, a minute Post Office on the High St, a single GP unit, only one NHS dental unit, an extremely small Police unit and very limited parking within the <b>town</b>. <b>We</b> almost lost our only garage (thanks to Herts CC), primaries and the senior school are virtually full and under the proposals, we will now lose the town's Fire Station! Compared to the Buckinghamshire villages of Pitstone and Ivinghoe, Tring is poorly equipped with decent play areas for children other than toddlers. House building along the 3 main entrance roads into Tring is already causing traffic problems. During construction and once the new houses are in situ, this will become even more intolerable because insufficient garage space has been included which will mean heavier off-road parking on narrow roads than only cater for two vehicles passing. Bus routes through the High Street, Brook Street and Wingrave Road will also encounter severe delays and problems..</p> <p><u>High Density Housing</u> Ifs sad to see both the Government and Councils still pursuing the failed over 30 year old housing ideas of John Preston, former New Labour Deputy PM! Looking round the new estates of near-by Aylesbury, Icknield Way in Tring plus those built in Pitstone-the houses are attractive enough <b>on the outside</b> but so often provide little inner storage room/capacity for modern living plus these vast estates are both crowded and badly planned. Narrow roads, no green areas, no garages for many, dark, minimum garden space (especially for the larger 3/4 bedroom houses) which is surrounded by the solid brick walls of adjacent housing - allowing no privacy and little natural sunlight!! Long terraces with off road parking only (no front garden and a lawn more in keeping with the size of a <i>Victorian</i> back yard). All estates are totally soul-less and so far out of town, that a car is essential to get to amenities and work. To my mind, these estates are nothing more than spiritually 'dead' spaces</p> <p>side</p>

- the human equivalent of battery chicken coops and the possible ghettos of tomorrow. Living in such spaces can only lead to neighbour conflict, mental anguish, depression, isolation and a feeling of being trapped. Together with mixing private and 'affordable' housing side by side is unsustainable for harmony and well being which, in tum, could lead to higher crime.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15396
<b>Person ID</b>	1271257
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Alastair Hogben
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such</p>

a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15408

**Person ID** 1259631

**Full Name** Fay Copestake

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** There is a lack of evidence and it appears that no assessments have been performed in order to make this delivery strategy of building large numbers of dwellings on Green Belt land, building TR02 and TR03 is unjustified.  
I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15434

**Person ID** 1271088

**Full Name** MIKE WALTERS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

Yes

* No	
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.</p> <p>The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.</p> <p>To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15449
<b>Person ID</b>	350823
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sue Yeomans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Chilterns Countryside Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>2.i. The LP fails to take into account the cumulative effects of development upon air quality, which is likely to be adversely impacted by the proposed expansions of Heathrow &amp; London Luton airports, both of which operate over the airspace of the Borough. The health of the substantial increase in an urban population, which the LP proposes, is more likely to be adversely affected, we would suggest, by proximity to flight paths which overfly 24 hours a day and by the destruction of green, open spaces and wooded areas which, otherwise, might afford some mitigation.</p> <p>2.ii. The LP states: <i>‘the potential to result in adverse effects on the local and wider landscapes, such as the setting of the Chilterns AONB’</i>. (4.4.9) Further, <i>‘....concentrating the majority of development in the Borough’s most sustainable settlements .... would help to reduce the amount of greenfield land required to deliver the levels of growth in the Local Plan, thereby reducing levels of adverse effects on local landscapes’</i>.</p> <p>Further: <i>‘Policies in the plan directly seek to protect the local landscape and townscape through protecting the natural environment and ensuring high quality design of new development.’</i></p> <p>The CCG strongly disagrees with these assertions as <i>‘the level of adverse effects on local landscapes’</i> at Tring and Berkhamsted are so severe that it is incomprehensible to view these proposals as a reduction in adverse impact. We strongly disagree that the LP policies <i>‘protect’</i> the Borough’s natural environment. Indeed, it is the view of the CCG, that they seek to <b>deliberately destroy</b> much of the best quality landscapes.</p> <p>Development of top quality agricultural fields and other Green Belt sites, abutting and visible from the Chilterns AONB with <i>‘neighbourhoods’</i> of between 2,200 and 1,870 homes, respectively, plus associated infrastructure of primary &amp; secondary schools, roads, commercial properties together with lighting and other services, can hardly be called, by any measure, as reducing impact and protecting the natural landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CCG strongly disagrees with the ‘vision’ for Tring where 2,700 houses are planned. The Group does not accept that any delivery and <i>‘mitigation’</i> of a <i>‘comprehensively planned new neighbourhood to the East of the town’</i> could ever <i>‘take into account sensitive views, landscape and protected environmental land’</i>. It is not possible to reconcile construction of an entirely new neighbourhood of 2000 plus houses, with associated schools, shops, roads etc with the destruction of natural, green open spaces of high quality agricultural land designated as Green Belt and affording key settings for the AONB.</li> </ul>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Tring Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15504
<b>Person ID</b>	400475
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Demidecki
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Tring Delivery Strategy (page 232-240)</p> <p>Tring Homes</p> <p>It is said (at 23.144) that the bulk of development will be development as a planned new neighbourhood to the east of Tring between Station Road and Bulbourne Road, ie on land either side of Marshcroft Lane. Around 2274 new homes are envisaged for TR01-TR06 on existing green field sites. This is excessive in scale and unacceptable. In the 2017 consultation it was envisaged that there would be about 1080 homes (Dacorum's Schedule of Site Appraisals for Large Greenfield Sites October 2017). In my comments on the 2017 proposals I pointed out that the hedges alongside Marshcroft Lane are old and of importance in their own right for their trees and shrubs and for the wildlife they support. I said that the following woody plants are to be found there: sycamore, elm, elder, blackthorn, field maple, ash, hazel, rose, holly, hawthorn, cherry plum, plum, spindle and dogwood (15 species in all). A count of woody plants along one 30 metre stretch alone has revealed six woody plant species, making the hedge according to Hooper's hedgerow hypothesis, some 600 years old. I also in my submission drew attention to the dawn chorus of birds to be heard along Marshcroft Lane in 2017. It is most important therefore that Marshcroft Lane, its verges and hedges are left intact (with a significant strip of land either side as well) as a connecting wildlife corridor behind the back of Grove Road and Grand Union Canal. The NPPF of course requires that development in Green Belt land achieves net environmental gain (NPPF para 72c) and is mitigated by compensating development of surrounding natural spaces.</p> <p>Tring Employment (page 235)</p> <p>In 23.149 there is reference to the release of Dunsley Farm growth area providing for additional offices/industrial/warehousing. Consideration should be given to the use of space and future development of the current</p>

green field sites to the north of the A41 between Tring and Aylesbury. There should be discussion about this between Aylesbury Vale District Council and the Council. There is no need for additional employment floorspace in TR01

Tring Retail (page 235)

Again the industrial area north of the A41 between Tring and Aylesbury would seem a suitable site for a new foodstore and there is no need for one within TR01.

Delivering Growth in East Tring (pages 238-239)

Ecological surveys and an environmental impact assessment of the proposed area of expansion of Tring to the east should be carried out and the Masterplan envisaged in 23.163 would need to address the findings. To meet NPPF requirements "wildlife corridors" need to be made explicit and mapped (NPPF para 174) along with their linkage to existing wild / natural areas.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15516

**Person ID** 1162394

**Full Name** Grahame Senior

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green

Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

The land east of Tring between the existing boundary and the canal, giving green space between the town and Tring station is a precious asset and should be preserved at all costs. The Dunsley (Tr01) development area is far less sensitive and can be fully developed with less impact on infrastructure and much easier and efficient use of existing main access routes.

Brook Street/Market Place Development/Tring Market Auctions

This is currently a highly valued and much used asset for the town to me in the furtherance of community activities. The Market Auctions Site is a huge asset to the town and the whole site gives huge value to the life of this town for many diverse sectors of the community. Taking this space away for a trivial increase in housing provision is a very poor trade-off.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15526

**Person ID** 211488

**Full Name** Ms Alison Cockerill

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have just read the Local Plan for 2020-2038 and wish to record the following concerns for use in the consultation process, particularly relating to Tring. Thank you.</p> <p>The Foreward to the Plan states that ‘Dacorum will see significant growth and investment over the coming decades, particularly in housing’. Apart from figures supplied by central government there is no further explanation as to why this should be. I would like reassurance that Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) have challenged these figures and will continue to seek a reduction, particularly as there is already a parliamentary discussion taking place to effect severe restrictions on further growth in the southern half of the country.</p> <p>The Foreward notes that the ‘problem’ in South West Herts is unmet need in Watford but there is no suggestion of how these Plan will alleviate the situation unless there is an undisclosed policy of actively trying to move people to other areas of the borough.</p> <p>A large developing in Tring will undoubtedly mainly attract buyers from London, who can then commute back to the capital for work. Tring station has recently been updated to cope with the (pre-covid) demand; as I am sure DBC know, a sizeable percentage are part of the local cross county flow from Buckinghamshire, due to the much slower, less frequent rail service there. There is no detail in the Plan as to how DBC are going to enable further upgrades at the station, nor who will finance them. There is repeated comment within the Plan about encouraging the use of buses, acknowledging that to achieve this ‘modal shift’ will require a change of ‘mind-set’. This is a very naïve hope. There is no comparison between cars and buses for convenience or timing, buses are infrequent, unreliable, uncomfortable and not very clean. They do not provide door-to-door transport, you need to be fit enough to walk to the bus-stop and able to carry any purchases back home. I know I use them! (I do not drive). People who can afford to live in Tring can afford to run a car, or three in many cases, and this Plan will simply increase local car volume and pollution, a direct contradiction of the ‘Overarching Vision’.</p> <p>The Foreward also mentions easy access to three airports and the M25/M1, once again citing this as a reason to develop housing in Tring, once again encouraging car use and once again increasing noise and pollution. DBC acknowledge these side effects yet continue to purport in their ‘Overarching Vision’ that their policies ‘<u>mitigate and adapt to climate change, and conserve and protect the natural environment</u>’. I don’t think so. Incidentally, the Foreward quotes that Luton Airport is 20 minutes from Tring; this is both incorrect and misleading – local taxis allow an hour.</p> <p>Page 44 of the Plan reports that South West Herts has 188000sqm of office space and will not need any more. So why is office space included in the proposes employment areas-Tr01 and Tr06. A walk along the High Street will demonstrate ample opportunity in all the empty buildings for use as office space should the need arise. There also appears to be no</p>

acceptance of the reality of the post covid employment scene—home working will remain the norm, apart from anything else it is much cheaper for the employer. The suggestion that small industrial units/warehousing and possibly a supermarket would be sited on Tr01 raises questions. Land on LA5, the development area on the Icknield Way, included planned space for growth of the industrial site but this has not happened. So why is there any need for further allocations of land for industrial use when the original designation was not required? Having spent 40 years working in the retail sector I am at a loss to understand the comment that the current supermarket (Tesco on London Road) is 'overshopped'. What does 'overshopped' mean? It is not a retail phrase and would therefore imply that this is a lay term used to disguise other issues. Do DBC believe Tesco should have competition, and if so, why; surely it cannot be within a local authorities remit to try and affect a retailers profitability. Or is the suggestion that the footfall is so high the store constitutes a health and safety risk. If so, that should be addressed now, not at some time within the frame of the Plan.

Part 17 of the Foreward says that the Joint Strategic Plan 'will support existing retailing, more leisure, social, town centre living, evening economy' and that 'new developments need access to jobs, shops and services'. The last thing Tring High Street needs is an extension of retail outlets in Brook Street. There are numerous empty properties available now and if investment is forthcoming this is where it needs to be directed. Services are scant, apart from estate agents and hairdressers; there are no banks or travel agents and restaurants were closing long before the pandemic hit. Brook Street has been used before as a venue for retailing, most recently by the Friday market, but it has never been a success. It is simply too far from the main thoroughfare and people will not walk-fact! As for wider shopping needs, most local people use Aylesbury, Leighton Buzzard and Milton Keynes, moving cross county to Buckinghamshire. Hemel Hempstead is rarely a consideration; personally, I can only recall visiting twice in the last twenty years. Aylesbury is also a hub for leisure activities with an excellent theatre and cinema and extensive carparking.

Of major concern on the Plan is the direct lack of responsibility the planning authority – DBC- has for so many aspects of development. There is repeated mention, page 179 22.14 that healthcare is under the control of NHS England and Herts Valleys Clinical Commissioning Group, and page 179 22.21 states that 'developers should engage with the HVCCG to determine the health care requirements associated with new developments'. Really! Builders are to have an input in to how many doctors Tring needs! There is nothing further in the Plan to substantiate any claim of increasing healthcare in Tring, despite DBC envisaging an uplift in the population of up to 50% by 2038. The Plan places huge emphasis on 'wellbeing' as is the modern fashion with Covid 19, and precious little detail on practical improvements to actual medical care. There is only one doctors practice in Tring, with a pre-covid wait of at least a fortnight for an appointment. There is no longer an NHS clinic in Tring or Berkhamsted, no access to physiotherapy or chiropody. Most people in Tring access the Buckinghamshire hospitals at Stoke Mandeville, Amersham, and High Wycombe. At the time of writing Aylesbury has at least four vaccine centres-Tring and Berkhamsted have none. Stoke Mandeville Hospital has excellent public transport links, Watford hospital has none from Tring. DBC should be campaigning strongly for a new hospital in west Herts and for healthcare provision to be very local. Once again, there is ample scope to place a clinic in Tring High Street.

Also not DBC's responsibility is education, despite claiming in item 23.145 that Tr01 'will include a primary school' and in item 23.147 'there is a need for two primary schools and a secondary school'. The report states that HCC are now responsible for less than half of the county's schools, so who is expected to provide the extra education facilities, and where is the financial base for this. Once again, there is no data to support these claims. Many children from Tring already

cross county for schooling in Aylesbury; DBC need to take on board that Tring's natural established links are with Buckinghamshire, particularly Aylesbury.

The Joint Strategic Plan, Page12, 2.5, quotes 'new homes and developments will acknowledge local character and context'. The Overarching Vision page 26 claims 'to protect and enhance Dacorums distinctive historic environment'. The Design Outcome and Principles on page 153 will 'reinforce local character-noting height, volume, shape, orientation, siting, layout, landscaping'- and notes at 20.54 'the importance of history to a place's character. New developments must make a positive contribution'. These claims, for that is all they are, have not been employed at LA5, where the construction is overheight, visually intrusive and cramped. The building contractors openly admit the site is not in keeping with the local area. What control and input will DBC offer Tring residents to ensure a degree of control over any future growth of the town. Where are the measures to protect the established built environment –one of the suggestions fro Tr06 is to remove the Local History Museum, currently located to great effect in the only remaining building from the time of the livestock market. How does DBC reconcile that to 'the importance of history to a place's character'. The museum building should be preserved without question. In any development the boundary properties should be well spaced and the properties of low elevation to minimise their visual impact. The introduction to the Plan anticipates a growing number of elderly people, providing bungalows to allow them to remain independent would be a good start for any new builds.

Should building proceed at Tr01 I can find no mention of an alternative living being offered to the farmers at Dunsley Farm; where are DBC proposing they move to, to continue farming, as this country strives to become food sufficient post Brexit.

But perhaps the greatest concern in this Plan is the huge environmental damage that will occur. There is a list of consultative bodies in the introduction, but once again Bucks County Council are omitted, despite the Green Belt and Chilterns AONB and SAC crossing the county boundary within yards of Tring. There are numerous references to protecting the environment throughout the Plan. For example, from page 114, 18.5 onwards- local authorities have a legal duty to the environment under NPPF 'to conserve and enhance the natural environments and protect them from harm', there must be 'regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising all their functions'; 'ancient woodland and trees accorded the same level of importance as SSSI- a national priority under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan'. Further on, page 317 recognises 'the existing and historic field boundary pattern' and 'it's existing and future potential as a strategic wildlife corridor wildlife' at Tr01 Dunsley Farm. Tr03 has 'a historic field pattern, complex topography, well established internal and external hedgerows, a strong scenic quality, intact nature, and tree lined skylines'. DBC accept that there will be 'likely significant effects from Dacorum's planned growth to Ashridge SSSI and Tring Woodlands from the pressure of people and pollution'. And the solution appears to rest with the National Trust to deal with it. All the growth detailed in the Plan is completely contradictory to the stated aims in the Overarching Vision and will contravene every aspect of the quoted environmental protection DBC are supposedly taking into account. It is totally unacceptable and irresponsible to proceed with a Plan which causes such unmitigated damage to the environment.

There is nothing in the Dacorum Local Plan that will benefit or enhance Tring. There are very few substantiated facts and no benchmarking measures. All of it is in direct conflict with the Overarching Vision, which can only lead to the sad conclusion that the vision is pure P.R., an empty document that any local authority in the country could use. Tring and Dacorum deserve better.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15529

**Person ID** 1271403

**Full Name** RAJIV DUDWADKAR

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Re Dacorum future plans 202-2038.

There has been future proposals to build 2,111 in the Tring area doesn't surprise me. I lived here in supported housing for over 2 years and I am not happy living here.

I find the local people rude, small minded and arrogant and the good news is that I've suffered no racism, despite Tring being white and middle class.

I always see people walking their dogs, Tring being a very rural area due to the population increasing and due to one stupid laws, a lot of people are coming to this country, we are a small country, an island nation and our current population is 67 million and rising. Nigel Farage said a few years ago we have to build due to the rising population, a house every 7 minutes. I know who to blame for the housing crisis and that is M Thatcher. People who have money owe so many housing and a lot of housing in Dacorum are owned by land lords in London and this has increased rents by 5%. I used to live in Hemel, but I had to leave because a London landlord purchased my property and I've lost much of my things. There is a lot of housing fraud in the Asian Community, my late father many years ago suffered homelessness and used to own a house in Luton. Due to the population growth we will sink and we are a small island with so many problems. There are too many nimby's and people must suffer the truth. All the countryside will be built on and we can be a "brown and pleasant land" which will be another stupid phrase. Due to the low birth rate in the white communities they will become a minority within a 100 years, Luton where I used to live for 31 years will be B.A.M.E. majority and is happened



currently. Currently people concerning about green issues and the environment should look at population and it's not racist to see this happening. People need homes and somewhere to live and that is simple common sense. I really hate political correctness and the "woke" generation and we are losing our history and identity. Plant, species and wildlife are all disappearing and this is all to do with population and I've travelled extensively around the world and this is a worldwide problem. For example in 2008 I've visited Australia and the Great Barrier Reef but it is being affected by pollution and population. Tring has too few shops and recently one salon has relocated and closed.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15532

**Person ID** 1263124

**Full Name** Andrew Criddle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment** The need for a major new sporting hub and extra 15 Ha of playing space in Tring has been well represented to DBC planners for many years and is supported by the Town Council. This was just to meet existing demand, so it is clear one or more new sporting hubs are needed in Tring (similar to that proposed by Thakeham for Berkhamsted) to meet the proposed increase in population there.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15553

**Person ID** 1271486

**Full Name** Mrs Lynda Moores

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Tring Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I have lived in the beautiful small market town of Tring for the past 25 years (now 55) and brought up 3 children here. The proposed development plan for Tring is heartbreaking for us all as it would change this friendly, charming small market town into a sprawling large town and destroy so much of the beautiful countryside and history which makes Tring what it is.</p> <p>Marshcroft Lane is a haven for wildlife and for the people of Tring an idyllic place to walk, destress, enjoy family time and be part of nature. Dog walkers, runners, families, children on bikes (my children learnt to ride there) have an escape to the country right on their doorsteps. It is filled with birdsong, there are foxes and it is beautiful. I walk my dog there nearly daily and have been doing so for over 15 years and meet so many people relaxing, exercising and enjoying being outside. During this pandemic it has been a God send for the people of Tring and in normal times is well used and loved.</p> <p>As a member of Tring running club I appreciate how lucky we are that after a stressful day at work we can meet up and within minutes be in the country, either on the farms around the cricket club or out in the countryside enjoying the benefits that only open space can bring.</p> <p>The tennis club to which I belonged and all my children used is set in a unique location. Away teams commented on the smell of the farms and how lucky we were to have such as backdrop. Entering a town with farmland makes it special, gives you the sense of well being and has a unique charm about it. A charm that makes Tring the place it is.</p> <p>The station was located outside Tring by the Rothschilds to prevent the town from being filled with smoke from the trains. When my children come home to visit now they more often or not walk from the station. They comment on how good it makes them feel after being in London, how beautiful it is, how green, how special.</p> <p>You are our council, you are here to <u>represent</u> the people who live here. Tring is a <u>small</u> market town surrounded by <u>beautiful</u> countryside. It has <u>farms</u>, <u>green space</u> and a <u>history</u> which is why people like living here, what makes it special, gives it its charm yet the proposed development will destroy so much of that. As <u>our</u> council we should not be fighting you to preserve <u>our</u> town. It should not be the residents v the council. The farm opposite Tesco's belongs to the council which apparently means they can sell it if they like. Surely if it belongs to the council it belongs to Tring because the council is elected to represent them?</p>

Please work with the people of Tring to stop the development. Tring is a small, historic market town in an area of beauty just let it stay that way.

Since moving here

- The petrol station we used on Grove Rd gone – houses
- The health centre on Station Rd where my daughter had her eyes checked, my son speech therapy gone – houses
- The school (Frances House) where I worked for 14 years – gone houses
- The fields I used to walk to beyond the cemetery at lunchtimes – gone houses
- The small industrial site in town on Akeman Street where we had our car serviced and dog groomed – gone houses
- The fields on Grove Rd where I walked my dog (had a footpath sign by the gate when we first moved here) now fenced up – allocated for houses on your plan.
- The lovely old house just up from Hawkwell Drive on Station Rd, knocked down, gone houses
- The hall my children had parties in + brownies – gone houses
- The wildlife area on the rec which people fought their own council for for so long gone houses + much more.

We are a small town, you have taken nearly every space you can find within our town to build on already please STOP NOW.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15558

**Person ID** 1264530

**Full Name** BRENDA AND ROY HURLEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

Given the 55% growth of housing supply proposed within Tring in comparison to the 9% growth in population expected in Dacorum across the plan period. Given that it is clear on the basis of allocation alone that the proportion of growth to Tring is disproportionately higher than the expected population growth, I object to the concentration of the delivery strategy in terms of the scale of development of Tring.

There is a lack of evidence to justify the release of Green Belt land for the housing need delivery strategy, represented by the proposed allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03. Exceptional circumstances are required to justify the loss of Green Belt land for housing. The Council has failed to identify exceptional circumstances. The delivery of 1,800 houses within Tr02 and Tr03 would offer irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt and AONB, that which should be provided substantial weighting of harm as defined within the Framework. The collective benefits to outweigh such substantive harm has not been successfully identified by the Council so as to justify the loss and therefore the policy is not fit for purpose. I object to draft policies SP23 and SP24 on this basis.

The allocation of sites Tr02 and Tr03 would cause substantial harm to both the allocated site but also surrounding Green Belt land, destroying their openness and sense of permanence in a manner that has failed to be justified in accordance with Paragraph 136 of the Framework.

To step outside of the requirements identified within Paragraph 11 of the Framework for Plan making the Council has to provide exceptional reasons why they have to impact so negatively towards their environmental objectives. Until such a time when an assessment of the housing opportunities available within the existing settlement boundaries associated with Tring are undertaken, in conjunction with the further full assessment required to assess need for the borough, the delivery strategy remains inappropriate and as such the proposed allocation of Tr02 and Tr03 is completely unjustified.

**Included files**

**Title** Tring Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15613

**Person ID** 1271748

**Full Name** Ms Gosia Turczyn

**Organisation Details** Wigginton Parish Clerk  
Wigginton Parish Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Tring Delivery Strategy comment**

The Dunsley Farm allocation together with the other large Tring allocations will inevitably put additional pressure on Tring station. The plan recognises that additional parking provision will need to be made but this is not seen as a problem. However, the fact that Tring Station is within the AONB seems to have been overlooked by AECOM in their assessment for Dacorum.

The AECOM assessment carried out for Dacorum states that there is "No risk of coalescence with other settlements" a reference to a primary reason for the Green Belt which in this case means preventing Tring from merging with Berkhamsted but has direct implications for Wigginton. As Tring and Wigginton are less than 1 km apart there is a longer term risk of coalescence as the land at Dunsley Farm extends as far as the Wigginton village envelope. Should the proposed Dunsley Farm site go ahead, it would leave this remaining farmland somewhat isolated and could lead to the need for replacement agricultural buildings etc. and perhaps a replacement farmhouse.

Furthermore Hertfordshire County Council, who own Dunsley Farm have previously promoted for housing the farmland stretching from the A41 all the way up to Wigginton. It was included in the 2008 Site Allocations as 01h23 and 01h24 but not subsequently taken forward.

The recent change in Government policy together with the poor performance of the 3 large Tring allocations in terms of harm to the Green Belt and more particularly to a particularly sensitive part of the Chilterns AONB would make it appropriate to remove all three from the current plan. If after a more thorough site search no better alternative sites could be identified, then a more detailed assessment of these rejected sites should be included in the plan submission so that the Inspector can make the decision whether to include them or not. An Inquiry Inspector is unlikely to go against recent Government policy " We should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places"

**Included files**

# 23 Kings Langley Delivery Strategy responses

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS63
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS244
<b>Person ID</b>	1258859
<b>Full Name</b>	A Butcher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Paragraph 23.179: 'New development needs to offset its pressure on local infrastructure'. This is very important and should include positive actions to reduce traffic congestion in the area of development. The Rectory Farm site will exacerbate congestion in Coniston Road and Common Lane at school times where the environmental impact of stationary vehicles with engines running is already significant. Rectory Farm development will only offer opportunities to improve community benefits if a holistic plan includes the access and parking for the football ground in the green space and proper access on to the A4251 such as a mini roundabout. Green space will not be used if it is not on a route to somewhere (cycle/pedestrian) or has no parking.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS383
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260042
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Mitchell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS468
<b>Person ID</b>	1260624
<b>Full Name</b>	David Newton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Re: Sunderlands Yard, Church Lane, Kings Langley</p> <p>I act on behalf and upon the instructions of the owners of Sunderlands Yard, the extent of which is shown on the attached ordnance survey plan (referred to Sunderlands Estate).</p> <p>You will be aware that the yard, which has been in its current use for many years, is developed, in part, by a number of buildings currently occupied by a variety of companies. The majority of these companies have been in occupation for many years, some in excess of 30 years. In addition, there is an area of open land currently used for storage, vehicle parking, etc.</p> <p>My clients' family have owned the yard for several generations and at one time ran the family business from it. Despite repeated approaches, mainly from residential developers, to sell the site for redevelopment, they have resisted as they consider that it is necessary to retain employment land within the area, much having already been lost to redevelopment.</p> <p>Having consulted with the lessees currently in occupation on the site, there is unanimous agreement that the site should continue to be for employment generating uses.</p> <p>There are currently 12 companies operating from the site providing a range of business activities including printing, motor trade, provision of care workers, sale of carpets, repair and maintenance of NHS ambulances, haulage, building supplies and provide employment, in total, for approximately 140 people both on and off site, a large number of whom live locally.</p> <p>There is a steady and substantial demand for accommodation at Sunderlands Yard from local companies, many of whom have been displaced following redevelopment of their existing premises.</p> <p>My clients, the owners of Sunderlands Yard fully support policy SP26 "delivering growth in Kings Langley" in relation to the allocation of the site as a general employment area.</p>



*David Newton*

David Newton, MRICS

Chartered Surveyor

Managing Agent – Sunderlands Yard, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire

Skeber Cadson

Callington

Cornwall

PL17 7HW

**Included files**

[Sunderlands Estate plan.pdf](#)

**Title**

Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS474

**Person ID**

1260657

**Full Name**

Andrew Kennett

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

Sunderlands Yard General Employment Area.

I am objecting to the designation of Sunderlands Yard as a General Employment Area.

I have been a resident of Church Lane, which is the main entry route for Sunderlands Yard, for 25 years. All access to Sunderlands Yard is through residential streets and the presence of an industrial estate in that location has never seemed logical. I assume the reasons are historical.

A new strategy seems the opportunity to challenge the presence of industrial premises here. Much of its use in recent years has involved lorries from M25 using Sunderlands Yard for overnight stops and few people seem to work there full time. There is a lot of heavy lorry traffic - often at unsocial hours.

There is plenty of employment activity across the canal (albeit in another authority) including Imagination, the Ovaltine business park and the many small enterprises on Primrose Hill.

Is it possible to look at Sunderlands Yard in this wider context and view as more suited to residential development which would fit in better with its residential surroundings.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS479

**Person ID** 1258240

**Full Name** Adele Giles

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS641

**Person ID** 1261183

**Full Name** Oliver Fairfull

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.</p> <p>My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.</p> <p>The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.</p> <p>Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity? You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan. It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.</p> <p>Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.</p> <p>These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.</p> <p>In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets</p>

are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

**Included files****Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS659**Person ID** 1261122**Full Name** Mark Slade**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No** No  
\* Yes  
\* No**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment****Included files****Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy**ID** EGS1001**Person ID** 1261645**Full Name** Mrs Sonia Enright**Organisation Details****Agent ID****Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Having lived in Kings Langley for 44 years, I am now terrified that the beautiful surroundings of this village are slowly and systematically being eroded.</p> <p>To develop on Green Belt land at Rectory Farm would takeaway the limited area of green space we have between us and Hemel Hempstead. Together with plans for building in our area from Three Rivers District Council will impact heavily. Kings Langley would soon become a sprawling mass of houses going towards our neighbouring town. This would impact heavily on the physical and mental health of the residents having less areas to escape the bustle of town life.</p> <p>The traffic in the area is overwhelming the roads and Kings Langley cannot cope at present with the number of cars and lorries trying to get through. The noise and air pollution is almost unbearable now! From our house we can hear the traffic noise on the M25 and A41 without extra vehicles trying to drive through the village which would make the situation even worse. There is also very limited parking in Kings Langley.</p> <p>Kings Langley has a reputation for having not only an interesting history, a wonderful community, lovely shops and restaurants but also for its fields and footpaths allowing us to have great walks in the countryside.</p> <p>Please do not allow more buildings and a motorway service area ruin our environment. Thank you for your consideration</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1288
<b>Person ID</b>	1259116
<b>Full Name</b>	Tring in Transition (TinT)
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1511
<b>Person ID</b>	1262221
<b>Full Name</b>	John McCombe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am registering an objection to the large-scale encroachment onto green belt land at Rectory Farm.</p> <p>This will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-encourage coalescence with Hemel Hempstead/Nash Mills, substantially eroding the important wedge of green space between the two settlements.</li> <li>-increase traffic congestion and incidents in Kings Langley, particularly at the junction of Vicarage lane and the High Street, already the worst area, and now the site for a new Children's Day Nursery.</li> <li>-further damage the historic nature of Kings Langley, increasing the population by nearly 10%. Several smaller developments in the local area will only exacerbate this.</li> </ul> <p>I accept we have to take more housing, but I do not believe the number proposed on this site is supportable.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1928
<b>Person ID</b>	1262553
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Wallis

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2142
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2164
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2429
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2616
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2947
<b>Person ID</b>	1263377
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Messenger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3356
<b>Person ID</b>	1012318
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Hennell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Area Planner Canal and River Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Any new residential or employment uses adjacent to the canal or likely to result in an increase in its use should recognise the benefits the canal towpath can bring and actively look at ways these benefits can be increased and improved upon. This could include improvements to the towpath to allow it to be used more as a sustainable transport route but also include waterbased recreation and access facilities such as car parking. Developers should contribute to the costs of improving and maintaining these facilities through S106 and CIL payments. The Council should work closely with Three Rivers District and the Canal & River Trust to secure improvements to the towpath as it moves between the two authorities as it provides an important link for residents to reach facilities on both sides of the canal.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3407
<b>Person ID</b>	1263763
<b>Full Name</b>	Adam Kindred
<b>Organisation Details</b>	CBRE
<b>Agent ID</b>	1263757
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Adam Kindred
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<u>Vision for Dacorum's Places</u> With respect to the 'Vision for Dacorum's Places' this under-represents the role that Kings Langley can play in delivering sustainable growth. Kings Langley is grouped alongside Bovingdon and Markyate in the spatial strategy, neither of which have rail stations. Functionally, Kings Langley is 9 minutes on a direct train route into the principal settlement of Hemel Hempstead and this should be more appropriately reflected in the vision, aims and objectives for Kings Langley.

As noted in the October 2017 Settlement Profiles from Travel to Work data, 15.7% of trips of people living in Kings Langley are made by public transport. This is materially higher than both Bovingdon and Markyate at circa 10%. Incidentally, the figure for Kings Langley is also higher than the figure for Tring.

The distinction between Kings Langley and Bovingdon and Markyate is further highlighted in the Council's own evidence with Paragraph 2.30 of the Development Strategy Paper (2020) stating '*However, unlike Bovingdon and Markyate, it [referring to Kings Langley] does have its own secondary school, and access to a mainline railway station and reasonable levels of local employment.*'

The attractiveness of Kings Langley as a location for employment is further highlighted in the Employment Land Review (October 2017) in which it is stated that total office stock in Kings Langley is 33,000 sqm, with EGi reporting that there is just 200 sqm currently available. The amount of employment floorspace in Kings Langley is significantly greater than that at Bovingdon or Markyate.

The Sustainability Appraisal November (2020) states '*Option Cii considers higher growth at the villages of Bovingdon and Kings Langley, building upon their strengths as having a larger range of local services and facilities when compared to Markyate, and also that Kings Langley has better access to public transport.*' Whilst this is acknowledged in the evidence it is not reflected in the approach to housing allocations in the Large Villages.

### Strategic Objectives

The first theme of the Strategic Objectives is to '*deliver the identified housing requirement between 2020 and 2038.*' The launch of the consultation in November 2020 pre-dates the Government's response to the proposed changes to the Standard Methodology (December 2020). The response from the Government confirms that the annual housing target for Dacorum should be 1,023pa. The Strategic Objectives as set out in the Draft Local Plan are based on the lower number consulted on (922pa) and thus will need to be increased to 1,023pa to respond to the outcome of the consultation.

Ensuring that the Strategic Objectives are based on the figure of the Standard Methodology is a key requirement of soundness in presenting a positively prepared approach to the Draft Local Plan. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF (2019) is clear that an alternative approach to determining the minimum number of homes needed should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

A further strand of the Strategic Objectives is to '*strengthen Hemel Hempstead's role as a thriving business centre.*' Whilst it is appropriate that Hemel Hempstead will absorb the highest amount of growth as Dacorum's principal settlement, in delivering the aim to strengthen Hemel Hempstead's role as a thriving business centre it is important that a range of housing is provided to retain and attract talent. Key amongst this is working professional families who, whilst needing to be located close to Hemel Hempstead, require a housing typology as opposed to flatted developments. Locations such as Hill Farm in Kings Langley, in being located in close proximity to existing schools, are well placed to provide housing to respond to this need and contribute to wider aims to strengthen Hemel Hempstead's role.

A final key strand of the Strategic Objectives is to '*To promote the use of renewable resources, reduce carbon emissions, protect natural resources and reduce waste.*' Arguably the most significant natural resource within Dacorum is the Chiltern Beechwoods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and, specifically, Ashridge Commons and Woods SSSI.

Work undertaken as part of the Chiltern Beechwoods Topic Paper (2020) confirms that engagement with Natural England to date has confirmed that recreational pressure and air quality impacts are the greatest threat to the asset. Visitor surveys that have been undertaken at Ashridge Commons and Woods SSSI confirms *‘approximately 19% of total visits, taking account of frequency of visits, were from Hemel Hempstead. 32% of total visits were from Berkhamsted, with 6% from Tring.’*

As set out in Paragraph 4.34 of the Topic Paper it is further stated that *‘National Trust expect these percentages to be a minimum estimation of the number of visitors from Dacorum, as it does not assess all of the 24 car parks they have on site, especially those located closer to the settlements of Northchurch and Berkhamsted. In these locations, there is an expectation that most visitors are from the local area who know these smaller, local car parks or the ‘quieter areas’ of the site.’*

From the above data it is clear that a significant amount of the recreational pressure arises from Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring, with Kings Langley located furthest away from the SSSI.

From the Development Strategy Paper (November 2020) it is noted:

*‘Following discussions with Natural England, they have identified ‘long term wear and tear issues on the site’ and agreed that likely significant effects could not be ruled out for recreational pressure or air quality on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC. Therefore they advise that a precautionary approach should be adopted.’*

Paragraph 174(a) of the NPPF (2019) is clear that *‘to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity’.*

With Ashridge Commons and Woods SSSI susceptible to recreational pressures as a result of housing development, it is a key consideration to ensure that the spatial strategy for the Draft Local Plan embeds this into its approach. A key question asked of Paragraph 32 of the NPPF (2019) is whether or not adverse impacts can be avoided and, if not, how they are mitigated. This is consistent with the approach being advocated by Natural England that a precautionary approach should be adopted.

In the preparation of a sound plan that is consistent with the NPPF, it is necessary for the spatial strategy to appropriately respond to relieving recreational pressure on the SSSI. Kings Langley is located as the settlement furthest away from the SSSI and does not appear in the visitor surveys as a major ‘starting point’ for trips made to the SSSI (see Page 106 of Chilterns Beechwood SAC – Summary of Evidence 2020).

The increase in housing in Kings Langley, on appropriate sites, is needed to ensure a sound approach to the spatial strategy in relieving the pressure generated from significant development sites in Tring and Berkhamsted. Such a position would have been needed irrespective of the change in the Standard Methodology consultation, but it is now further reinforced that the sites needed to ‘plug the gap’ should be focused in those areas a greatest distance from the SSSI.

**Included files**

**Title**

Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS3442
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Plan states:  “23.173 It is located at the northern end of the village and lies reasonably close to a primary and secondary school, recreational space and sports facilities...”</p> <p><i>Comment: The proposed development of land at Rectory Farm will mean increased demand and usage of the sports facilities at the local sports clubs and at Kings Langley School. The school’s sports facilities already suffer from availability for use because of drainage and regular flooding issues and the clubs are constrained. Due attention should be given to supporting development of the existing clubs and creating new facilities for community use; e.g. supporting any proposed improvement to facilities at the school such as the creation of a new ATP.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3744
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3990
<b>Person ID</b>	1261840
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4019
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4268
<b>Person ID</b>	1261915
<b>Full Name</b>	Eleanor Lovett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Landhold Capital
<b>Agent ID</b>	1261754
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Eleanor Lovett
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Landhold Capital has fundamental concerns with regards to how the Council has approached Kings Langley in the emerging plan, in particular with regards to the quantum of development proposed and the delivery strategy. The plan suggests at present that Kings Langley will support development of at least 275 dwellings during the plan period to 2038, however that represents only 1.6% of the proposed housing to be delivered through this plan. Furthermore, since 2006, the Development Strategy topic paper confirms that only 68 new dwellings have been delivered, approximately 1% of housing delivered across the Borough, despite more than 3.4% of the Borough's existing housing stock being found at the settlement. Both the completions and planned growth therefore represent far less than would be expected of a settlement of this size and that benefits from good services and facilities and importantly a mainline train station. The adopted Core Strategy and Site Allocations Plan relied on the delivery of development within the village boundaries, as no Green Belt releases were facilitated through those plans at the settlement, which has constrained previous development and is likely to reduce the opportunities that remain within the confines of the village for further development.</p> <p>It is noted that in the supporting text provided in paragraph 23.168, the Council recognise the constraints to the settlement of Kings Langley. This includes the proximity to Hemel Hempstead to the north, the administrative boundary with Three Rivers to the east, congestion issues in the village centre and highway capacity issues with the M25/A41 to the south of the village. Notably, the Council do not identify any constraints to the west of the village, although it is recognised that any growth to the west would be constrained by both the Green Belt, and the village conservation area; although it is considered that both of these constraints could be suitably mitigated. Within this assessment of the settlement, flood risk is not specifically mentioned, although it is referenced later in respect of the Rectory Farm allocation which is recognised</p>

to have both environmental and flood risk issues. Notwithstanding those constraints, part of the site already benefits from planning permission and therefore the justification for allocating further growth at this site is rational, although there are arguably less constrained locations at the settlement including in particular land to the west between the built up village and the A41.

The Council has however given consideration to alternative locations for development at Kings Langley in the site selection process, as evidenced in the Site Selection topic paper, as well as in the previous draft of the plan. However, the topic paper confirms that the Council concluded that there were no exceptional circumstances to justify releasing from the Green Belt land to the west of Kings Langley, hence there being proposed allocation in this version of the Plan. This does not suitably explain why the land to the west of Kings Langley was no longer suitable for release and does not present a justified approach to removing an allocation at a highly sustainable settlement, with no other alternatives to accommodate development. The approach taken by the Council has been to arbitrarily restrict growth at Kings Langley despite its sustainability and has not taken a long term approach to Green Belt review where the boundaries are expected to withstand beyond the plan period. This is evidently not the case for King Langley, with any future development requiring further Green Belt release beyond the plan period. This is not a sound approach to the distribution of development and does not follow the guidance of the Framework with respect to spatial review of Green Belt boundaries. To remedy this deficiency a comprehensive approach should be taken to reviewing the Green Belt boundary at Kings Langley to ensure a settlement boundary is provided in the long term, and certainly beyond the proposed plan period.

The justification given for the removal of Green Belt releases from the plan is inadequate and does not establish a spatial approach to the decision. Instead it is apparent from the Housing Topic Paper that the reduction in the housing requirement to 16,596 dwellings has directly informed the selection of housing allocations, so that an allocation of a certain housing scale was identified for removal in order to meet the new reduced housing figure; rather than removing those allocations at lower order/ less sustainable settlements. The methodology for site selection clearly identifies that the reduction of housing allocations to meet the new housing requirement was a factor in stage 4/5 of the site selection process, which Landhold Capital considers should not have been the case given the standard method housing requirement for the Borough of 1023 dwellings, resulting in at least another 1,800 dwellings that should be allocated in the plan to meet the minimum housing requirement. Furthermore, the removal of allocations based upon their scale alone and not their suitability for development is flawed. It is identified that the Council discounted site 89, to the west of Kings Langley, *'because on balance, there are more suitable sites in the area which can better deliver the strategy of the Local Plan'* however, it is argued that land to the west of Kings Langley is the least constrained at the settlement and should feature in the plan given the sustainability of the settlement and the Borough's high housing needs. Furthermore, that no additional allocations were made at Kings Langley to replace Site 89, rather the overall housing numbers to be delivered at the settlement reduced. This is despite the suitability of the settlement, its excellent access to public transport and the low scoring Green Belt contribution of the site. Landhold Capital considers that Site 89 and more widely land to the west and north-west of Kings Langley should be reassessed as a housing allocation on the basis that Kings Langley should be directed a higher level of housing growth and that the Council should increase its housing figure to meet the current standard methodology housing figures.



At paragraph 23.171 the plan establishes that 275 dwellings will be delivered at the settlement between 2020 and 2038. The plan goes on to state that the bulk of this development will be met at the Land at Rectory Farm Growth Area, which is to provide 145 homes. This is set out in Policy SP26, although there is a slight discrepancy between the figure at paragraph 23.171 and mentioned elsewhere in the Plan for 275 dwellings to be delivered at Kings Langley, whilst Table 40 in Policy SP26 only sets out the delivery of 274 dwellings. Notwithstanding the numerical discrepancy, it is noted that the Council is reliant on 48 of these dwellings or 17.5% of the dwellings to be delivered at the settlement to come forward through windfall sites. This represents a substantial number for a Green Belt restricted settlement, and does not represent a positively prepared strategy for growth at the settlement and meeting housing needs, as it is instead reliant on speculative opportunities that may or may not arise during the plan period. Whilst it is accepted that a windfall allowance can be included in housing supply at the Borough level, Landhold Capital considers that it is inappropriate to specify this at the settlement level. If the Council expects at least 274 dwellings to be delivered at Kings Langley as set out in Policy SP26, the Council should specify where these dwellings are to be delivered through identified sites. This is important to ensure that the plan is sound, in that it is an effective strategy that is deliverable over the plan period to provide for the necessary level of housing provision.

Given the contents of paragraph 138 of the Framework, in relation to settlements that are well-served by public transport, it is considered that the Council should have sought to allocate more growth at Kings Langley to meet the Borough's housing needs at a sustainable location. As the release of Green Belt is critical to meeting the Borough's housing needs, the Council should be mindful of the Framework's requirements in terms of sustainable patterns of development and also the guidance in respect of boundaries in Paragraph 139, and the need for boundaries to endure through and beyond the proposed plan period. The current allocations and settlement boundary of Kings Langley do not provide for any further growth beyond the plan period and therefore directly contradicts this central theme advanced by the Framework for Green Belt boundary reviews.

It is also noted that in the supporting text to the policy, the Council establishes a requirement for new development to offset its pressure on local infrastructure in the village, which will be sought either through direct on-site provision or through off-site contributions. However, in a previous paragraph in relation to the main allocation at Rectory Farm, (23.174) it states:

*“The County Council recognises that this site, is not of a sufficient scale to be able to deliver or secure much in terms of transport infrastructure or bus service improvements. However, enhancements to pedestrian and cycle routes to the station and access to bus services should be explored.”*

There appears therefore to be a disconnect between the Council's aspirations for local infrastructure improvements and the proposed strategy and housing allocations to be delivered at Kings Langley, particularly when considering the other allocation proposed is only for 10 dwellings. It is unlikely that any development delivered through windfall sites and/or rural exception sites will be able to deliver infrastructure improvements and therefore if there is a need or desire to deliver infrastructure improvements at the settlement, it is critical that further allocations are identified to ensure that land is released from the Green Belt through this plan to facilitate development to deliver this.

The Plan recognises that a Neighbourhood Plan is being progressed for the settlement, which the Council contends at Paragraph 23.170 *“will have an important future role in locally shaping growth in the village”*. However, Paragraph 136

of the Framework states that the Neighbourhood Plan will only be able to make amendments to Green Belt boundaries if strategic policies through the emerging Plan establish the need for change, which the Plan as currently drafted does not. If it is anticipated that the Neighbourhood Plan will seek to allocate sites, it anticipated that these are likely to fall within land designated as the Green Belt, and if so then provision needs to be made through this Plan for the release of land from the Green Belt.

Overall, Landhold Capital is concerned at how the Council has dealt with Kings Langley through the emerging Plan. Despite the sustainability of the settlement, the existing services and facilities and the benefits of the mainline train station, the Council has only sought to allocate a small proportion of growth here through two allocations totalling 155 dwellings. Whilst combined with existing commitments that will increase slightly, overall it is not proportional to the size or suitability of the settlement to accommodate growth. The Council's strategy does not appear to accord with the Framework in terms of sustainable patterns of growth and locations served by public transport. It also a concern that the plan is not proposing enough growth to meet the Borough's anticipated housing needs according to the standard method for the plan period, which the Framework at Paragraph 35 confirms it is expected that authorities will plan for this as a minimum.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4538
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4779

<b>Person ID</b>	1264516
<b>Full Name</b>	GWENDOLYN BALL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to strongly object to the overdevelopment of Kings Langley in the Dacorum Local Plan. The housing numbers will impact on the Green Belt which needs to be protected. There already is overprovision of housing. Other Local Plans in Watford, Three Rivers and St Albans already have massive housing target which will put additional pressure on Kings Langley. What is the evidence base for these housing numbers? Have the housing numbers been updated in relation to the impact of the COVID Pandemic and BREXIT? What is the true local need?</p> <p>Green Belt is vital to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another into one large urban sprawl. Green Belt is necessary to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns as distinct and unique places which are treasured by residents and visitors alike. This will be lost by packing more and more houses in. Also the infrastructure cannot cope now. Local roads are congested.</p> <p>Green Belt is also critical in helping to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. This is critical for wildlife in ensuring there are sufficient habitats for biodiversity and connected landscapes and wildlife corridors. We are already losing many species and it is our responsibility to safeguard against any more destruction. The Green Belt is also vital for residents health and wellbeing as has been evidenced by research during the COVID Pandemic and this use of the countryside will continue to increase. The countryside is also treasured by visitors enjoying local walks. The Green Belt must be protected. The Local Plan does not address issues of climate emergency. The preservation and restoration of nature is vital to all our survival. This is all our responsibility. Stop building any more unnecessary, unaffordable and unsustainable houses on precious Green Belt.</p> <p>All these additional houses places so much strain on our already overstretched infrastructure. This impacts Bedmond with the ever increasing volume of traffic passing through our Village.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4942
<b>Person ID</b>	1143273
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Mark Rogers
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I do not accept that there is a convincing case for the release of the Rectory Farm site from the Green Belt. Its removal would be contrary to the basic principles of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF 2019. The feature that strikes me strongest is the need to prevent coalescence and construction on the Rectory farm beyond the initial construction on the brownfield site will see this Green Belt area destroyed. I intensely dislike the term Green Belt release which is a complete misnomer as it will result in the eradication of these green havens between urban developments. The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence (NPPF, paragraph 133). Undeniably, the Rectory Farm site is a very open feature in the landscape setting of the village.</p> <p>The five purposes of the Green Belt are set out in paragraph 134 of the NPPF and have been thoroughly analysed against the sub-areas of the Borough and the sites which have been promoted and allocated in the draft Strategy. In respect of the Rectory Road site, the most important of the five purposes is “to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another”. The Association believes that the site is extremely important in its fulfilment of the function, in terms of its location in the development corridor running from the northern edge of Watford through to Tring. Within the gap between Watford and Hemel Hempstead, Abbots Langley is one of a number of distinctive smaller settlements where local separation helps to prevent the merging of the main towns.</p> <p>More locally, I would stress the importance of the Rectory Farm land as part of the gap between Kings Langley and Nash Mills, on the southern edge of Hemel Hempstead. Despite the presence of the railway overbridge, the Green Belt here performs a key role in maintaining the identity of Kings Langley and the areas to the north.</p> <p>The detailed boundaries of the site KL02 are shown on Map 49 of the Allocations section of the Growth Strategy, together with notes on site-specific requirements. These have clearly been informed by the updates to the evidence base, in particular the Green Belt Review Stage 3 and the Landscape Sensitivity Study (Arup, August 2020), and the above-mentioned Greenfield Site Assessment Study (AECOM, January 2020).</p>

A total of 34 sites in the Borough were reviewed, including Rectory Farm, listed as site 97 in the study. Three other sites in Kings Langley were assessed – Hill Farm (site 89), Land North of Coniston Road (site 94), and Coniston Road (site 99). The Green Belt boundary reviews were also informed by the parallel Landscape Sensitivity Study, the results of which are summarised in Table 5.1 of the Green Belt Review. Of the 32 sites assessed across the Borough, only three are considered to have low landscape sensitivity to change, one of which is Rectory Farm.

The key findings of the Green Belt Review are set out, by settlement, in Chapter 6, which concludes that only the Rectory Farm site is proposed for allocation in the Local Plan (see map at Figure 6.1). Details are shown on the Settlement Pro Forma for Kings Langley (Appendix B, page 46). I profoundly disagree with this recommendation, for the reasons which are set out below.

I have studied the detailed results of the assessment for Rectory Farm (site 97), in Appendix A (pp.62/63) of the Stage 3 Green Belt Review. In the first stage of the analysis, if the site were to be retained in the Green Belt, it is noted that the eastern, western, and southern boundaries are easily recognisable and likely to be permanent. I strongly support this conclusion, a point which was stressed in its response to the Issues and Options consultation in 2017.

In the second stage of the analysis, if the site were to be released for development, the southern boundary, on the corner of Rectory Lane and Gade Valley Close, is considered to be readily recognisable. In view of the planning permission for housing on the area of the former farm buildings, this part of the assessment is largely academic. The Society believes that a new and defensible Green Belt boundary could be achieved by a landscape screen at the northern edge of the new development.

The northern boundary of Site 97 was not considered to be defensible by the consultants. In response, I would draw attention to the fact that the area beyond is occupied by the Kings Langley football club pitches, which are appropriate uses in the Green Belt. In terms of the Green Belt purposes, Rectory Farm together with the playing fields forms part of a tongue of open land which penetrates the built up area. It is an intrinsic part of the character of the village and its surroundings.

As noted above, the findings of the Stage 3 Green Belt Review were informed by the parallel Landscape Sensitivity Study. I see the assessment methodology and criteria, plus the criteria, thresholds and definitions for the evaluation of landscape susceptibility and sensitivity which were used in the analysis of each of the land parcels.

The assessment of the Rectory Farm site (Parcel 97) is at Part 7 of the Study (pp.171-176). It is assessed as having “neighbourhood” landscape value, for a number of reasons, in terms of its “relatively-fragmented” condition and its proximity to the “arterial” road and an area of 20th century housing. The community farm is mentioned, but is no more. Nevertheless, the fact that the area forms a backdrop to the Grand Union Canal, creating visual amenity value for a wider audience, is mentioned. I believe that this aspect has been severely underplayed by the consultants.

In terms of its landscape susceptibility, the parcel is given a low-moderate score. Again, I consider that the urban influences are overstated. The degraded landscape and clutter attributed to the community farm will no longer be a factor when that part of the site has been redeveloped. Although the Grand Union Canal area is recognised as a positive element, no account has been taken of the contribution to landscape character of the area to the east of the canal, which is within Three Rivers District.

In the view of the Association, the low overall assessment of landscape sensitivity does not fully recognise the strategic value of the site and its contribution to the green corridor described by the River Gade and the Grand Union Canal. No mention is made of the ecological value of the areas adjacent to the Canal, and its role as a wildlife corridor. The landscape guidance for the site is welcome in principle, however, and contains recommendations for the enhancement of the area which could be implemented without releasing it from the Green Belt.

This is not the first time that the Borough Council has proposed to allocate the Rectory Farm site for housing. I would remind the Council that it was rejected by the 2002 Inspector's report into the Dacorum Local Plan 1991-2011. The Inspector stated as follows:

*"In reaching this conclusion, I have taken account of the fact that Rectory Farm would be well-located in terms of its accessibility to local bus routes, schools and shops in the village centre. However, in the light of its impact on the Green belt, on the character of the area and on the capacity of the local infrastructure, I am not satisfied that it would constitute a more sustainable location than any of the other greenfield housing proposal sites."*

Since the report was issued, nothing has changed in 20 years apart from the planning permission on part of the site. Arguably this has removed some of the negative impacts on the landscape and provides opportunities for enhancement. For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed allocation at Rectory Farm and its removal from the Green Belt. The Borough Council is urged to withdraw the proposal and to re-consider its strategy for Kings Langley in consultation local stakeholders and Three Rivers District Council.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5075

**Person ID** 1264258

**Full Name** Fintan FitzPatrick

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5159
<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5235
<b>Person ID</b>	1264608
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Beadle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5301
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5501
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
--------------	---------------------------------



<b>ID</b>	EGS5522
<b>Person ID</b>	1264048
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5562
<b>Person ID</b>	1264491
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5690

<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5772
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5906
<b>Person ID</b>	1264752

<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6265
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6410
<b>Person ID</b>	1264750
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Joyce

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6625
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6816
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6989
<b>Person ID</b>	1265081
<b>Full Name</b>	Caitlin Neale
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7030
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7080
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7111
<b>Person ID</b>	1265142
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Anderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Re 23.176, I don't think Sunderlands Yard at Kings Langley should be given General Employment Area status, because this industrial yard is located highly inappropriately in a very residential area, does not employ a significant number of people, and for years has been causing serious problems for constituents. The noise at anti-social times of day, the dust, the storage of hazardous substances, and the heavy goods traffic in Church Lane are just some examples of the problems suffered by the many neighbouring residents. It also could be said that the current owners of the yard are opposed to selling the yard for residential redevelopment, so it does not need GEA protection.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7161
<b>Person ID</b>	1265074
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Wilson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7401
<b>Person ID</b>	1142987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr. Philip China
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am sending this email in response to the Local Plan Consultation and wish the following views to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not believe that such a high number of houses being considered can be deployed in this borough without significant environmental damage.</li> <li>• In relation to Kings Langley the loss of green belt land to accommodate housing development would severely impact the village when there are more suitable brownfield sites available. Infrastructure in the village (schools, doctors, etc.) would not be able to cope with any more significant development, especially after having such a huge upsurge in population with the Ovaltine development in recent times.</li> <li>• If green belt is used for housing development it is not doing anything to address the climate emergency.</li> <li>• Green belt land protects villages like Kings Langley from merging into the neighbouring towns/villages. This then protects areas from becoming huge conurbations.</li> <li>• Post Covid I believe that everyone has learnt the value of our open spaces and need for recreation outdoors.</li> <li>• The effect of such large housing developments around the borough will impact on water supply, potentially damage local rivers and the wildlife they support, further affecting the impact on climate change.</li> <li>• What about the impact of further building causing water run off and associated flooding already being experienced in Kings Langley?</li> <li>• Car parking and traffic is already a huge issue in many places and particularly (in my experience) in Kings Langley.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7746
<b>Person ID</b>	1265004
<b>Full Name</b>	Elizabeth Checkley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>My comments, as a long term Dacorum Resident of Kings Langley, are more far reaching than your plan for Dacorum and include points you are missing.</b></p> <p>At present we are a village separated from Hemel Hempstead and Watford by countryside. Good for the health and wellbeing of all residents and wildlife.</p> <p>I am concerned that our village is split between two council areas - Dacorum and Three Rivers. Both councils have their own development plan without, it seems, any consideration for what the other is planning!</p> <p>Also we have been told about a proposed new Motorway Service Station to be developed at Junction 20 of the M25 by Three Rivers Council. This is also developing Green Belt Land and will adversely impact on Kings Langley in many ways.</p> <p>So the combined green belt development plans of the two councils and the Motorway services will make Kings Langley just another part of the urban sprawl of Hemel Hempstead and Watford.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7747
<b>Person ID</b>	1265004
<b>Full Name</b>	Elizabeth Checkley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>The increase in traffic, noise, air pollution, light pollution, traffic congestion would all be detrimental to human health and nature.</b> The loss of the Green Belt can never be recovered. The joy of being surrounded by countryside will be lost, not only to the people of Kings Langley but also the surrounding villages and town areas. Do you know we can still hear Skylarks? But for how much longer?</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS7916
<b>Person ID</b>	1265994
<b>Full Name</b>	R KIRBY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Green belt land is what divides us from neighbouring towns to avoid urban sprawl and will result in KL becoming joined with Watford, Apsley and Hemel and merging into each other. Building on this land will also have a detrimental effect on local people's health and wellbeing, as well as the loss of habitat for birds and animals. We have badgers, foxes, hedgehogs, owls, bats, Kites etc in Kings Langley and the surrounding green belt land which will suffer greatly if this huge number of houses is built here.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8150
<b>Person ID</b>	1266091
<b>Full Name</b>	Kristen Pontello
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am writing to add my feelings about the Dacorum plan until (2038). I am a new Kings Langley resident as my husband and I purchased our first property together in August. It was such an exiting time, especially in such a strange time we

live in. We fell in love with Kings Langley, the lovely village feel and the huge amount of outdoor and green space. It is and was beautiful. What a great and safe spot to hopefully bring kids up in at some point.

Since we started hearing about the plans a little while ago it deflated us quite a lot. If we had known about this earlier we most likely would not have bought in the area. Our fault for not doing the research I guess. I as many other people I keep seeing are against this move. The amount of houses proposed being built is way over what is necessary and I read based on surveys from years ago. The parking in KL is bad enough already without adding more houses, more development within this area.

Taking away more green space to build more homes is not only incredibly bad for the environment in a time we are all trying to be more sustainably minded, but also just makes all these beautiful green spaces just look like everywhere else. The charm is lost.

Again I am sure my thoughts don't matter much, but I think it's important to still write to at least not have any regrets. I am against this as I know many residents are and I hope if this can't be solved at least plans can be scaled down. I worry for ourselves, the area and generations to come.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8176

**Person ID** 1266120

**Full Name** Sarah Haque

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

I would like to voice my concern to proposed plans for the future of Kings Langley as I believe them to be flawed. Please reconsider the current plan as the negative effects could be catastrophic.

In particular I object to the use of old data to base needs and projections on and the apparent disregard for the vital importance of the green belt. Legislation preventing building was put in place specifically to curtail building expansion such as this. The road infrastructure was not designed to handle current traffic let alone such large increases. Solutions to this problem should be of utmost importance. Environmental impact can also not be understated. Please look again and review all possible options to using brownfield sites and appropriate growth numbers.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8196
<b>Person ID</b>	1266145
<b>Full Name</b>	Sue and Tony Connell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I do not live in the area but do visit my daughter and her family regularly.</p> <p>I do not agree that 16,000 houses should be in the plan and that you should be using up to date figures which would halve the number of houses required.</p> <p>This pandemic has shown how important our local green spaces are and that our green belt land must be protected. I do not believe that inflated housing needs an exceptional circumstance for removing Decorum's Green belt.</p> <p>Green belt land such as Rectory Farm helps protect the shape, size and character of towns and villages like Kings Langley and prevents them merging into one another.</p> <p>The plan underestimates the potential for brownfield regeneration opportunities which have increased due to the pandemic with more people working from home.</p> <p>The plan does little to address the improvements on infrastructure that will be needed to support 16,000 new houses. Have you been into Hemel town centre recently - there is nothing there - no one can afford the rates and the town is becoming a ghost town. With that amount of new houses, we would need a better town centre and local shopping area.</p> <p>We do not have enough school places as it is - there is always a problem getting into the neighbouring schools, both of my other children did not get their first place for their children.</p> <p>I take my grandchildren to school and this is getting to be a very busy journey due to the amount of cars on the road.</p> <p>We also do not have enough water to supply all the extra houses. It is a fact that the extra water needed can only be extracted from the chalk aquifer which in turn will damage the borough's chalk rivers which are classified as priority habits by the Natural Environments &amp; Rural Communities Act 2006.</p> <p>The traffic is already bad when I visit my daughter and her family.</p>

We do not have space or faculties for that amount of houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8209

**Person ID** 1144631

**Full Name** Mrs Ann Johnson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

Highway safety - Accidents are a regular feature of this part of Hempstead Road where traffic is either decelerating or accelerating to or from the short 40mph section which begins at the point where the access road is planned. No changes are planned to the 40mph designation. Under the latest planning consultation document, areas that would be protected from development would include sites which would justify more stringent development controls to ensure sustainability. This would include areas such as the Green Belt on Rectory Farm. This is because this Green Belt at Rectory Farm is not a large area, but its removal will have an enormous impact on 'urbanising' the village setting. In terms of that part of Kings Langley within Three Rivers District Council, paragraph 1.30 of the Growth Strategy, there is a clear acknowledgement of the "duty to cooperate" under Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance. Whilst welcoming the work that the Borough Council has done with neighbouring authorities, and the current initiative to prepare a South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan. Completion of the document, however, is not expected for about two years and it is unlikely that it will be fully adopted by all five authorities by the end of 2023.

Engagement with other authorities has taken place on strategic matters in South West Hertfordshire (as stated in paragraph 1.32). One of the key issues listed is the potential unmet housing needs of Watford. At the more local level, however, there is insufficient consideration of the role and function of Kings Langley in the wider sub-region. Both the Borough and Parish boundaries are tightly drawn – to the east by the Grand Union Canal and to the south by the M25. This is clearly acknowledged in paragraph 23.167 of the Growth Strategy. Despite this, and the statement that the Borough Council works closely with Three Rivers District Council to ensure a "consistent settlement-wide approach", it is concluded that "we can only plan for the Dacorum part of the village." The above statement is disappointing, as the Growth Strategy does not fully acknowledge the cross-boundary potential for development. In paragraph 23.176, it is

stated that “While there are reasonable levels of employment in the village, most of this is located in Three Rivers, which this Council has no planning control over.” Although the strategy includes proposing a site (KL03) for employment uses at

Sunderland’s Yard, Church Lane, there is no specific reference to potential sites for employment and housing which are in Three Rivers but adjacent to the village. As previously stated Three Rivers District Council will be seeking to maximise the areas of brown field land for housing development; in that respect, and an area of 30 hectares to the east of the Grand Union Canal is referred to as the Kings Langley Employment Area (KLEA). This represents over 60% of the Council’s Brown Field Register, and it is clear that the authority has a policy of converting employment sites in the KLEA to housing. A number of these employment sites in the KLEA have already been lost to 250+ housing units. These include Astra Zeneca, West Herts College, Shannon House, Pinnacle House, Primrose Hill (two sites). Conversion of many of these sites for housing will significantly increase pressures on infrastructure and services, most of which will gravitate towards the parish of Kings Langley on the west of the canal. Other sites were identified by Three Rivers District Council for thousands more houses on Green Belt sites bordering the KLEA. For this reason, no further housing should be built on the Green Belt at Rectory Farm before there is clarity about how many more houses Three Rivers District Council plan for these Green Belt sites bordering the parish of Kings Langley.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8252
<b>Person ID</b>	1145886
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lucy McRae
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please reconsider your Local Plan. It is not what Dacorum (or us very nearby Three Rivers) residents want.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building of 16,000 new homes during 2020 - 2038 in Dacorum is far too high and the projection is based on outdated data from 2014 as you are well aware. This would result in the loss of 850 hectares (or 1,214 football pitches) of irreplaceable green belt land in Dacorum, part of which includes Rectory Farm in Kings Langley.</li> <li>The proposed plan fails to take into account the opportunities to redevelop existing retail and commercial sites.</li> </ul>

- Your proposal to build on green belt land completely fails to address the climate emergency and the impact on infrastructure.
- The pandemic during the last 12 months has shown us all how important our local green spaces are. It is your duty and requirement to protect the region's green belt land. Once it's gone, we can't get it back!
- Green belt land such as Rectory Farm and throughout Dacorum helps protect the shape, size and character of towns and villages like Kings Langley and prevents them merging into one another. I chose to move to the wonderful village of Kings Langley to raise my family. Your proposal would just be the tip of the iceberg and starts to undermine the meaning of our village. Going ahead with the Local Plan in its current state would start to create a place that would not resemble the place we chose to move to.
- The proposed plan underestimates the potential for brownfield regeneration opportunities which have increased due to the pandemic with more people working from home.
- Your plan does not address far enough the improvements on infrastructure that would be needed to support 16,000 new houses. Five years ago my oldest child was not offered a place at the nearest primary school in our village due to oversubscription. (He also did not get a place in the next four nearest schools!) How could the schools cope with all these extra families that would arrive in our village? What about the GPs, parking areas, public transport, shops? My mind boggles.
- Dacorum does not have enough water to supply all the extra proposed houses. The extra water needed can only be extracted from the chalk aquifer which in turn will damage the borough's chalk rivers which are classified as priority habitats by the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006. This water source is natural, finite and irreplaceable.
- Please think of the long term effects of potentially generating the problems of all these extra humans living in a space that would not be able to cope with them.

Thank you for considering my comments and I really hope the Plan is adapted to a far more manageable number of new dwellings in Dacorum.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8339

**Person ID** 1157311

**Full Name** John Thomson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

As a resident of Kings Langley Parish, and therefore of Dacorum BC, herewith my comments, albeit at the 11th hour. I merely wish to make four points in this email form:-

- 1 I have tried to follow Government dialogue on required national housing numbers but, as well as being confused, one conclusion stands out - the numbers are unnecessarily over-estimated. Inter alia they do not appear to have taken into account a lower housing requirement following Brexit and the current pandemic, particularly having regard to Government strategy to put greater emphasis (levelling up) into the north of the country.

Therefore, the proposed average target of 922 pa new dwellings is in my opinion too high. In reality, a lower target will result in a reduced need (if any) to encroach on sacrosanct green belt.

- 1 I personally object to the release of any green belt land for housing or other development - the UK does not face a housing crisis, it faces a population/immigration crisis which needs addressing. I am pleased to note that the Council has not carried forward the unjustified release of green belt land at Shendish (including the golf course), Wayside Farm at KL, and Hill Farm at KL, and I feel the Council should try harder to meet its (reduced) targets from brownfield sites, non-green belt, yet-to-become sites, and from "windfalls" that will continue to arise.
- 1 KL has "done its bit" towards the development expansion of the borough, by way of the pressure from (a) recent housebuilding (I am advised that since the last local plan (2002) approx 3500 new dwellings have been accommodated in KL and the surrounding area), (b) the proximity of Three Rivers which appears to be allowing much construction in its borough abutting KL whereby the occupiers will look more to KL for their services, and (c) the possibility of an enlarged J20 M25 becoming busier with a Moto motorway services area, etc
- 1 I even object to the release of green belt at Rectory Farm, but if such is the price to be paid to keep a balance within the borough so be it. The A4251 is becoming congested at times, especially at the Apsley end, and further development at Rectory Farm will increase coalescence between HH and KL. On a point of principle, retention of green belt inter alia to obviate coalescence must be respected and not gradually eroded.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8736
<b>Person ID</b>	1152689
<b>Full Name</b>	MR AND MRS T AND C PEARSON



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We live in Kings Langley, a village community. We would like to preserve this sense of community. In trying to increase the capacity for others to live in a village community through intensive or over development you will destroy the very sense of the large village that we are and we risk ending up being joined with Watford and Hemel. We need the green and open spaces for our health and well being and to provide the sort of environment we sought when we moved here so many years ago. The pandemic illustrates very well the need to preserve open space.</p> <p>There is clearly not the infrastructure, at any level, in place to support further development, be it in the form of housing or MSA in the village and there is insufficient regard paid to infrastructure improvement in the plan..</p> <p>We believe that there are numerous brown field site opportunities in Dacorum and feel that these should be fully exploited before any further encroachment is made on the green belt. We therefore object strongly to any further development of green belt land in the Kings Langley area.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8804
<b>Person ID</b>	1266789
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr and Mrs Jenkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Regarding infrastructure, in Kings Langley the schools and health services are currently over-subscribed, local entertainment is limited to pubs and restaurants and the roads are over-loaded. Peak time traffic levels bring the High

Street to a standstill in the morning and late afternoon, with Heavy Goods Vehicles exacerbating this issue, particularly when any of the surrounding roads or A41 by-pass are busy or closed for accidents or repairs. In addition, public transport services are very limited during the day, with a daily bus service only between Aylesbury and Watford buses and not running past 7pm for 6 days of the week nor beyond 6pm for the hourly service on Sundays. This is not an attractive proposition for young people or young families outside the village who would prefer to live in towns where they would be better served with a higher level of education and health services, public transport and other amenities.

The Government published the Ten Point Challenge in November 2020 for a Green Industrial Revolution, “Building back better, supporting green jobs, and accelerating our path to net zero” “We will build first hundreds, then thousands, of miles of segregated cycle lane and create more low-traffic neighbourhoods to stop rat-running and allow people to walk and cycle. We will expand school streets, which have caused dramatic falls in traffic and pollution around schools. We have already started this transformation with £250 million spending this year as part of the PM’s announcement that we will spend £2 billion over this Parliament. A new body, Active Travel England, will hold the budget, inspect schemes, and assess local authorities for their performance on active travel. We will also launch a national programme of support to increase uptake of electric bikes”.

In 2017 the Parish Council held a Village Poll asking the question “Do you believe the Green Belt in and around the parish should be developed, as is being considered in the Dacorum Local Plan 2017 consultation?": 99% of those who voted, cast their vote against ANY Green Belt development.

The Parish Plan survey in 2019 found 95% of respondents wanted Kings Langley to remain a village with 96% valuing the sense of community with accessibility to surrounding countryside being a key benefit to everyday living. The proximity of open space was regarded as a key defining characteristic by 98% of local people.

The latest version of the draft Neighbourhood Plan has an overarching vision “To preserve and enhance what parishioners most value about Kings Langley *in line with the priorities suggested by the 2019 Parish Plan Survey* - the village status of Kings Langley, environmental action, greenbelt, proximity to open countryside, canal, woods and common, its thriving high street and strong sense of community.”

In addition, Kings Langley ‘straddles’ the Grand Union Canal, even though the parish boundary is the canal itself. (The area of Kings Langley to the east of the canal falls within Three Rivers District Council.)

As a community and in its employment, social and services infrastructure, the area of land that lies between the canal and the railway line to the east, from Gallows Hill bridge by *Kings Langley* Railway Station in the south to the Nash Mills bridge in the north, is an integral part of Kings Langley. The two areas are interdependent; retail and restaurants, doctors and dentists, schools, churches, community facilities, employment, commercial and public transport services. The majority of these are within the Kings Langley parish boundaries with the result that those living to the east of the canal tend to ‘cross the canal’ to access them.

However, the entire Employment Area in this part of Three Rivers, some 30 hectares, is classified as Brownfield land for housing development. Already lost is employment land at Pinnacle House, West Herts College, Shannon House, Alpine Press and two other sites in Primrose Hill amounting to over 250 units which have either recently been approved for housing or are currently going through the planning process. This is putting even more of a strain on roads, shops,

schools, health services and related infrastructure in the parish of Kings Langley. An important consideration should be any residential and commercial properties that have been granted permission that have not been built (in date or lapsed). It should also be noted, Three Rivers initial draft Local Plan consultation document also included 2 enormous developments of hundreds of houses on Green Belt land close to Station Road on an area described in their consultation as 'Kings Langley Estate'.

You will be aware the Dacorum draft Local Plan envisages nearly 300 dwellings in the village over the life of the plan, but it is likely over 80% will be built in the first few years putting an immediate strain on the village *without* any additional supporting infrastructure. This will inevitably compromise two other aims in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, namely "Safeguarding the rural, tranquil character, biodiversity and green spaces of the parish" and "Protecting the individual identity of Kings Langley, ensuring that encroachment on neighbouring settlements is minimised by maintaining the current inter-settlement gaps."

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8808

**Person ID** 1266789

**Full Name** Mr and Mrs Jenkins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

In terms of that part of Kings Langley within Three Rivers District Council, paragraph 1.30 of the Growth Strategy, there is a clear acknowledgement of the "duty to cooperate" under Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance. Whilst welcoming the work that the Borough Council has done with neighbouring authorities, and the current initiative to prepare a South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan. Completion of the document, however, is not expected for about two years and it is unlikely that it will be fully adopted by all five authorities by the end of 2023.

Engagement with other authorities has taken place on strategic matters in South West Hertfordshire (as stated in paragraph 1.32). One of the key issues listed is the potential unmet housing needs of Watford. At the more local level, however, there is insufficient consideration of the role and function of Kings Langley in the wider sub-region. Both the

Borough and Parish boundaries are tightly drawn – to the east by the Grand Union Canal and to the south by the M25. This is clearly acknowledged in paragraph 23.167 of the Growth Strategy. Despite this, and the statement that the Borough Council works closely with Three Rivers District Council to ensure a “consistent settlement-wide approach”, it is concluded that “we can only plan for the Dacorum part of the village.”

The above statement is disappointing, as the Growth Strategy does not fully acknowledge the cross-boundary potential for development. In paragraph 23.176, it is stated that “*While there are reasonable levels of employment in the village, most of this is located in Three Rivers, which this Council has no planning control over.*” Although the strategy includes proposing a site (KL03) for employment uses at Sunderland’s Yard, Church Lane, there is no specific reference to potential sites for employment and housing which are in Three Rivers but adjacent to the village.

Three Rivers District Council will be seeking to maximise the areas of brownfield land for housing development; in that respect, and an area of 30 hectares to the east of the Grand Union Canal is referred to as the Kings Langley Employment Area (KLEA). This represents over 60% of the Council’s Brownfield Register, and it is clear that the authority has a policy of converting employment sites in the KLEA to housing. A number of these employment sites in the KLEA have already been lost to 250+ housing units. These include Astra Zeneca, West Herts College, Shannon House, Pinnacle House, Primrose Hill (two sites). Conversion of many of these sites for housing will significantly increase pressures on infrastructure and services, most of which will gravitate towards the parish of Kings Langley on the west of the canal. Other sites were identified by Three Rivers District Council for thousands more houses on Green Belt sites bordering the KLEA. . Again, an important consideration should be any residential and commercial properties that have been granted permission that have not been built (in date or lapsed).

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9739

**Person ID** 1154016

**Full Name** LEIGH KARAVAIS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

I am opposed to the local plan because of the following reasons:

- We need to retain our green belt, we have already got new houses being built on the brownfield site in Rectory farm, we need to retain the greenbelt that we have.
- You are not using the most up to date data, you are basing this on 2014 numbers. Kings Langley has already seen a number of developments - please use the most relevant data.
- Building on the greenbelt doesn't help the current climate situation, you will be removing green open spaces that have wildlife, we need to preserve this for our children. If COVID has taught us anything we need open spaces to use for our mental health. - Green belt is an ideal place to do this.
- People moved to this village because it is a village we do not want it to be merged with towns, it is what makes the area we live in special.
- We need to look at more brownfield sites, people won't be going back to office locations now that we have moved to be a more agile country, why can't these be looked at first?
- We don't have the infrastructure to support more housing, you should be looking to build areas that you can create schools, doctors and other local amenities - rather than putting more stress and strain on existing ones.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9811

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

Children's Services. Development proposed within Kings Langley during the plan period amounts to an increase of 210 dwellings on two separate allocations, plus further developments arising from windfall and existing developments, which are, at this time, expected to be approximately 120 dwellings. This amounts to an additional child yield of 0.55fe when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield.

There is currently no expansion capacity within the local primary school (Kings Langley Primary School). The county council considers that there is currently no feasible option to locally accommodate the additional child yield arising from

these developments at a primary Demand for additional secondary school places could however be met in new schools located in Hemel Hempstead

**Paragraph 23.174**

Transport. References to capacity improvements with regard to the M25 Junction 20/A41 should be removed, as measures to mitigate the issue may not simply and solely be capacity. The South West Herts Growth and Transport Plan puts forward schemes including bus priority here, so the text should be amended as follows:

*“The junction will be subject to continuing modelling and assessment to help the Council, County Council and Highways England work towards measures to ~~improve highway capacity~~ the impact of congestion.”*

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS9839

**Person ID** 1267726

**Full Name** WENDY BROWN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

I do not agree that 16,000 houses should be in the plan and that you should be using up to date figures which would halve the number of houses required.

This pandemic has shown how important our local green spaces are and that our green belt land must be protected. I do not believe that inflated housing need is an exceptional circumstance for removing Decorum's Green belt.

Green belt land such as Rectory Farm helps protect the shape, size and character of towns and villages like Kings Langley and prevents them merging into one another.

The plan underestimates the potential for brownfield regeneration opportunities which have increased due to the pandemic with more people working from home.

The plan does little to address the improvements on infrastructure that will be needed to support 16,000 new houses. Have you been into Hemel town centre recently - there is nothing there - no one can afford the rates and the town is becoming a ghost town. With that amount of new houses, we would need a better town centre and local shopping area.

We do not have enough school places as it is - where would a new school be built as well?

We also do not have enough water to supply all the extra houses. It is a fact that the extra water needed can only be extracted from the chalk aquifer which in turn will damage the borough's chalk rivers which are classified as priority habits by the Natural Environments & Rural Communities Act 2006.

My son and daughter go to Kings Langley School and it already takes us longer than necessary to get there, with the poor parking down Red Lion Lane and all the road works that are occurring.

We do not have space or faculties for that amount of houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10043

**Person ID** 1160198

**Full Name** Nick Karavias

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

I am opposed to the local plan because of the following reasons:

- We need to retain our green belt, we have already got new houses being built on the brownfield site in Rectory farm, we need to retain the greenbelt that we have.
- You are not using the most up to date data, you are basing this on 2014 numbers. Kings Langley has already seen a number of developments - please use the most relevant data.
- Building on the greenbelt doesn't help the current climate situation, you will be removing green open spaces that have wildlife, we need to preserve this for our children. If COVID has taught us anything we need open spaces to use for our mental health. - Green belt is an ideal place to do this.
- People moved to this village because it is a village we do not want it to be merged with towns, it is what makes the area we live in special.
- We need to look at more brownfield sites, people won't be going back to office locations now that we have moved to be a more agile country, why can't these be looked at first?

- We don't have the infrastructure to support more housing, you should be looking to build areas that you can create schools, doctors and other local amenities - rather than putting more stress and strain on existing ones.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10264

**Person ID** 1153993

**Full Name** Eric Martin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

A significant part of Kings Langley lies within Three Rivers. As written, the Plan continues to place reliance on the areas 'to the east of the canal' as a source of employment for local people. However, this area represents a major part of the total area on the Three Rivers Brownfield register, and that Council is taking every opportunity to convert commercial properties into housing. This not only reduces employment opportunities, but it adds to the load on the infrastructure in Kings Langley. Whilst the Plan acknowledges that 'this requires that the Council works closely with Three Rivers District Council to ensure that we have a consistent settlement-wide approach', there is little evidence that this is taking place - no examples are cited - and the comment 'we can only plan for the Dacorum part of the village' appears to indicate that the two Councils are acting independently, to the potential detriment of all Kings Langley residents. This needs to be addressed.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10306

**Person ID** 1154031

**Full Name** EMMA MARSHALL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am a Kings Langley resident living under Abbots Langley Parish. The recent “Lakeview” housing that has been developed along the road from me has caused a massive flooding issue along Railway Terrace. All this happened despite it being a known flood risk. I remain unconvinced that housing plans truly take into account the impact their development has on their surroundings. Our area is also under threat from the development of a monstrous service station. All of these proposals will make Kings Langley unrecognisable.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10932
<b>Person ID</b>	1143226
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Cheryl Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Kings Langley often feels like the forgotten end of the Borough.</p> <p>Initiatives often include other areas but omit Kings Langley. Even the documents for this consultation were advertised as being available at Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring libraries, but not Kings Langley. Because of being constantly overlooked, it feels like the areas opportunities and issues are not fully understood.</p> <p>Kings Langley is in the unusual position of straddling the two boroughs of Three Rivers and Dacorum, not to mention being close to the boundaries of Watford and St.Albans Boroughs too. This means that Kings Langley is impacted by planning decisions made by them as well.</p>

There have been a number of large developments in Three Rivers that impact the village such as Ovaltine, Lakeside, Home Park Mill Link Road. Literally HUNDREDS of dwellings that aren't included in DBC's figures. On top of this, there are developments at Apsley Lock, Red Lion Lane and the possibility of a MOTO service station at junction 20 of the M25. It's easy to see why Kings Langley feels attacked from all sides!

Increased housing anywhere else in the area will also have an impact on Kings Langley due to it being the main access point for the M25. This is a real bottleneck point.

There is a difference between housing NEED and housing WANT. Developers may well be keen to build extensive developments in the Home Counties for a high financial return, but this shouldn't be at the expense of these community's identities. **House number targets should be challenged.**

In relation to Kings Langley, the site selection topic paper states:

"6.22 The Council is confident that the **adverse effects arising from the proposed allocations at Kings Langley**, identified through evidence gathered to date (including the Sustainability Appraisal), can be sufficiently mitigated through site specific and other policy requirements included in the draft Local Plan."

However, it doesn't state WHAT will be put in place so it's impossible to see how the adverse effects will be mitigated.

It can take decades (if not longer) for biodiversity and wildlife habitats to establish to the extent they have in Kings Langley. On Rectory Farm alone, 3 different species of bats, badgers, foxes, muntjac deer, birds and insects have all been recorded. This can't be replaced by planting a few trees on street corners and putting some grass between parking spaces.

Flooding problems either side of canal by the proposed development may well be exasperated by building on this flood plain.

Some development is inevitable and change should be embraced. DBC has the opportunity to highlight the historical significance of Kings Langley, such as royalty (the first ever Duke of York) buried in the centuries old church or the ruins of the old palace and priory. Make Dacorum famous for the RIGHT reasons and not just an over-crowded traffic jam that people try to avoid.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11389

**Person ID** 1207629

<b>Full Name</b>	Strategic Planning Department
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Strategic Planning Department Three Rivers District Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy: Capacity issues with the M25/A41 junction are a mutual issue in Dacorum and Three Rivers and it is recognised that growth in both authority areas will potentially have an impact on capacity on this network. Three Rivers is also committed to modelling and assessment of the junction and will ensure that any identified impacts can be mitigated and managed appropriately; it is intended that suitable and achievable measures to improve capacity will be included in TRDC's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12390
<b>Person ID</b>	232349
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Lawrence Parnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I have the following comments on the Dacorum Local Plan; Emerging Strategy for Growth, particularly in relation to Kings Langley. These comments also necessarily reflect that a significant portion of Kings Langley – its community and infrastructure - lies within Three Rivers District Council. The Dacorum and Three Rivers areas are interdependent; one

is not isolated from the other and neither should be the subject of separate and/or different policy approaches. It essential that the two Authorities responsible for Kings Langley liaise and plan together.

### **Employment.**

Part 1, paras 2.7 and 15.6 confirm the need for increase and retention of Employment Areas. Para. 2.9 requires safeguarding of existing local employment areas and to that end confers General Employment Area status on Sunderlands Yard (para.15.5). However, by far the largest employment area serving Kings Langley is that in Home Park Mill Link Road, and along Station Road/Primrose Hill/Railway Terrace – in all, approximately 30 hectares (source; Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) Brownfield Register).

Already, by virtue of its Brownfield designation, TRDC has permitted the conversion to residential of the former Astra Zenaca offices and Stannah House. Also, at the time of writing, permission is being sought for residential use on the site of the former West Herts College, and under construction for residential is the former industrial site adjoining Masters Yard. And given the Brownfield designation there is likely to be much more to come. Not only does this represent substantial diminution in local employment but the additional population places a demand on the community and social infrastructure of Kings Langley virtually all of which is within the area of Dacorum Borough Council (DBC). Yet there is no mention, let alone consideration, of this in the Local Plan; Emerging Strategy for Growth beyond a bland acknowledgement that most local employment is within the adjacent area of TRDC. It is vital for the credibility of the Local Plan, and in particular the furtherance of Part 1, paras., 2.7, 2.9, 8.7, 15.6 and DM17, that in respect to Kings Langley:

- 1 DBC takes into account the changes already approved and taking place within the TRDC area, and
- 2 Consults with TRDC, and argues against further diminution in existing employment floorspace.

### **Transport.**

Para. 23.168 speaks of constraints:

- Traffic growth in the TRDC area.
- Congestion in High Street / Watford Road
- Capacity issues on the M25 and A41

Omitted from mention is the potential for an off-line MOTO Motorway Services at the M25, Junction 20, just yards from the DBC border. Beyond mention of a future improvement to J20 (para.10.4) (unspecified as to when) the Local Plan makes no comment as to how the constraints might be eased. Worse, the quantum of new homes planned for Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring will result in exponential traffic growth on the A41 and A4251, and into/out of J20. DBC must maintain a close interest in and respond to TRDC and the Highways Authorities on the MOTO proposals. The latest (February 2021) from MOTO is a proposal to add an extra approach lane onto the J20 roundabout from each of the M25 (east and west), and the A41 (north and south), with no increase in scope of the roundabout itself nor consideration for the A4251. Madness!

Further, within the DBC Local Plan, there is no reference to, or acknowledgement of, the HGV traffic flows generated by the Kings Langley Employment Areas – Sunderlands Yard and those in the immediately adjoining TRDC area in Primrose Hill, Station Road and Home Park Mill Link Road – let alone how improvements might be achieved.

Also unconsidered is the role of the A4251. This road, as High Street and Watford Road, is first a conduit for through traffic travelling north/south, notwithstanding the role of the A41. It is also a relief road whenever any of the M25, J20 and/or the A41 are jammed. Kings Langley is immediately and directly impacted.

The A4251 is also a receptor for local distributor roads; from the east Gallows Hill, Station Road, Toms Lane and Primrose Hill via Waterside, The Nap, Church Road and Home Park Mill Link Road/Watford Road, and from the west, Chipperfield Road, Langley Hill, Vicarage Lane, and Common Lane, the latter set being under additional pressure twice every weekday from schools traffic.

Such is the impact of traffic on Kings Langley that, notwithstanding the primary duties lie with other Authorities / Agencies, the Local Plan is seriously deficient if it fails to specify DBC's objectives and intentions for Kings Langley in DM51.

As if to underline this, the laudable aims of para. 2.14 cannot be believed whilst the locations listed in para 23.168, plus adjacent J20, do not merit an AQMA and inclusion at para.18.53.

Rail. Given the significance of the mainline to commuter and local journeys through Dacorum it is noticeable that there has been no consultation with Network Rail or Rail Transport Operators. Surely their medium/long term intentions for services is essential consideration, bearing in mind consequences that may follow the commissioning of HS2, increased commuter usage consequent upon population growth in Dacorum, Three Rivers and Watford, and the potential of Kings Langley for Park & Ride given its proximity to the M25 J20, M1 and the A41. In recent years Kings Langley has also been suggested as an interchange for trains to/from the north (consequent on HS Phase 2) linking direct to the Channel Tunnel.

### **Housing.**

Brownfield. Despite the nationally acknowledged importance of Brownfield sites for new housing there is no reference to the role of Brownfield in the strategy for determining the location of new housing in Dacorum.

Further, and important to Kings Langley as a whole, there is no indication that DBC is aware that TRDC has scheduled their entire Kings Langley Employment Area (30ha) as Brownfield. Indeed, Part 2, para.23.176 is states "...there are reasonable levels of employment available to the village, most of this is located in Three Rivers over which this Council has no control." It seems therefore that DBC is unaware of, let alone has consulted with TRDC upon the significant Permissions already granted - the loss of local employment and floor space at Astra Zeneca, West Herts College, Stannah House, Alpine Press and two former commercial sites in Primrose Hill - and their replacement by a substantial number of homes.

Green Belt. The endorsement of the NPPF (Part 1, para.19.5) and the omission of Kings Langley from the locations defined at Page 135 is welcome. However the suggestion that Rectory Farm will ultimately deliver 200 dwellings (Part 4, pages 326/327) runs counter to this. This number should be reduced to 55 dwellings (the number already approved) to align closer to the NPPF criteria.

**Services and Facilities.**

The 'Overarching Vision for Growth by 2038' (sic) (Part 1, page 24) states that Kings Langley will have strengthened its role in providing services and facilities to serve residents and the adjacent rural communities; and (will) have secured additional and improved local community facilities'. Yet in Part 2, page 242, Delivery, none are identified nor is there any recognition of the immediate, and likely further, additional demand emanating from the TRDC area.

Planning for Kings Langley cannot function or deliver cohesively when the two Authorities (DBC and TRDC) respectively responsible for its adjacent parts do not consult, and integrate their Plans.

Para.23.178 implies that Kings Langley has just one GP practice. Really! Please check.

**Tourism.**

Part 1, para.15.18. Why is Kings Langley overlooked? Viz: the tomb of the first Duke of York in All Saints Church, the site of the Royal Palace (including a recently revealed built segment opposite the Old Palace PH) and Priory, and Langley Hill the apocryphal source of the rhyme 'The Grand Old Duke of York'. Please consult with Kings Langley History Society.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
--------------	---------------------------------

<b>ID</b>	EGS12463
-----------	----------

<b>Person ID</b>	498378
------------------	--------

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Dunham
------------------	----------------

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Clerk to the Council Kings Langley Parish Council
-----------------------------	--

<b>Agent ID</b>	
-----------------	--

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
------------------------	--

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
---------------------------	--

<b>Yes / No</b>	
-----------------	--

* Yes	
-------	--

* No	
------	--

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

Returning to the needs of local people, as you will be aware, in 2017 the Parish Council held a Village Poll asking the question "Do you believe the Green Belt in and around the parish should be developed, as is being considered in the Dacorum Local Plan 2017 consultation?": 99% of those who voted, cast their vote against ANY Green Belt development.

The Parish Plan survey in 2019 found 95% of respondents wanted Kings Langley to remain a village with 96% valuing the sense of community with accessibility to surrounding countryside being a key benefit to everyday living. The proximity of open space was regarded as a key defining characteristic by 98% of local people.

The latest version of the draft Neighbourhood Plan has an overarching vision “To preserve and enhance what parishioners most value about Kings Langley *in line with the priorities suggested by the 2019 Parish Plan Survey* - the village status of Kings Langley, environmental action, greenbelt, proximity to open countryside, canal, woods and common, its thriving high street and strong sense of community.”

In addition, the Parish Council would also wish to make the point that Kings Langley ‘straddles’ the Grand Union Canal, even though the parish boundary is the canal itself. (The area of Kings Langley to the east of the canal falls within Three Rivers District Council.)

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12464

**Person ID** 498378

**Full Name** Mr Paul Dunham

**Organisation Details** Clerk to the Council  
Kings Langley Parish Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

As a community and in its employment, social and services infrastructure, the area of land that lies between the canal and the railway line to the east, from Gallows Hill bridge by *Kings Langley* Railway Station in the south to the Nash Mills bridge in the north, is an integral part of Kings Langley. The two areas are interdependent: retail and restaurants, doctors and dentists, schools, churches, community facilities, employment, commercial and public transport services. The majority of these are within the Kings Langley parish boundaries with the result that those living to the east of the canal tend to ‘cross the canal’ to access them.

However, the entire Employment Area in this part of Three Rivers, some 30 hectares, is classified as Brownfield land for housing development. Already lost is employment land at Pinnacle House, West Herts College, Shannon House, Alpine Press and two other sites in Primrose Hill amounting to over 250 units which have either recently been approved for housing or are currently going through the planning process. This is putting even more of a strain on roads, shops, schools, health services and related infrastructure in the parish of Kings Langley.

It should also be noted, Three Rivers initial draft Local Plan consultation document also included 2 enormous developments of hundreds of houses on Green Belt land close to Station Road on an area described in their consultation as 'Kings Langley Estate'.

Finally, the Dacorum draft Local Plan envisages nearly 300 dwellings in the village over the life of the plan, but it is likely over 80% will be built in the first few years putting an immediate strain on the village *without* any additional supporting infrastructure. This will inevitably compromise two other aims in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, namely "Safeguarding the rural, tranquil character, biodiversity and green spaces of the parish" and "Protecting the individual identity of Kings Langley, ensuring that encroachment on neighbouring settlements is minimised by maintaining the current inter-settlement gaps."

In summary, Kings Langley Parish Council would ask that Dacorum Borough Council reconsider its approach and respect the overwhelming views of our residents.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12828

**Person ID** 1144631

**Full Name** Mrs Ann Johnson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment**

Regarding infrastructure, in Kings Langley the schools and health services are currently over-subscribed, local entertainment is limited to pubs and restaurants and the roads are over-loaded. Peak time traffic levels bring the High Street to a standstill in the morning and late afternoon, with Heavy Goods Vehicles exacerbating this issue, particularly when any of the surrounding roads or A41 by-pass are busy or closed for accidents or repairs. In addition, public transport services are very limited during the day, with a daily bus service only between Aylesbury and Watford buses and not running past 7pm for 6 days of the week nor beyond 6pm for the hourly service on Sundays. This is not an attractive proposition for young people or young families outside the village who would prefer to live in towns where they would be better served with a higher level of education and health services, public transport and other amenities.



Returning to the needs of local people, as you will be aware, in 2017 the Parish Council held a Village Poll asking the question “Do you believe the Green Belt in and around the parish should be developed, as is being considered in the Dacorum Local Plan 2017 consultation?”: 99% of those who voted, cast their vote against ANY Green Belt development.

The Parish Plan survey in 2019 found 95% of respondents wanted Kings Langley to remain a village with 96% valuing the sense of community with accessibility to surrounding countryside being a key benefit to everyday living. The proximity of open space was regarded as a key defining characteristic by 98% of local people.

The latest version of the draft Neighbourhood Plan has an overarching vision “To preserve and enhance what parishioners most value about Kings Langley *in line with the priorities suggested by the 2019 Parish Plan Survey* - the village status of Kings Langley, environmental action, greenbelt, proximity to open countryside, canal, woods and common, its thriving high street and strong sense of community.”

In addition, Kings Langley ‘straddles’ the Grand Union Canal, even though the parish boundary is the canal itself. (The area of Kings Langley to the east of the canal falls within Three Rivers District Council.)

As a community and in its employment, social and services infrastructure, the area of land that lies between the canal and the railway line to the east, from Gallows Hill bridge by *Kings Langley* Railway Station in the south to the Nash Mills bridge in the north, is an integral part of Kings Langley. The two areas are interdependent; retail and restaurants, doctors and dentists, schools, churches, community facilities, employment, commercial and public transport services. The majority of these are within the Kings Langley parish boundaries with the result that those living to the east of the canal tend to ‘cross the canal’ to access them.

However, the entire Employment Area in this part of Three Rivers, some 30 hectares, is classified as Brownfield land for housing development. Already lost is employment land at Pinnacle House, West Herts College, Shannon House, Alpine Press and two other sites in Primrose Hill amounting to over 250 units which have either recently been approved for housing or are currently going through the planning process. This is putting even more of a strain on roads, shops, schools, health services and related infrastructure in the parish of Kings Langley.

It should also be noted, Three Rivers initial draft Local Plan consultation document also included 2 enormous developments of hundreds of houses on Green Belt land close to Station Road on an area described in their consultation as ‘Kings Langley Estate’.

You will know the Dacorum draft Local Plan envisages nearly 300 dwellings in the village over the life of the plan, but it is likely over 80% will be built in the first few years putting an immediate strain on the village *without* any additional supporting infrastructure. This will inevitably compromise two other aims in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, namely “Safeguarding the rural, tranquil character, biodiversity and green spaces of the parish” and “Protecting the individual identity of Kings Langley, ensuring that encroachment on neighbouring settlements is minimised by maintaining the current inter-settlement gaps.”

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS12830
<b>Person ID</b>	1144631
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Ann Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>In terms of that part of Kings Langley within Three Rivers District Council, paragraph 1.30 of the Growth Strategy, there is a clear acknowledgement of the “duty to cooperate” under Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance. Whilst welcoming the work that the Borough Council has done with neighbouring authorities, and the current initiative to prepare a South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan. Completion of the document, however, is not expected for about two years and it is unlikely that it will be fully adopted by all five authorities by the end of 2023.</p> <p>Engagement with other authorities has taken place on strategic matters in South West Hertfordshire (as stated in paragraph 1.32). One of the key issues listed is the potential unmet housing needs of Watford. At the more local level, however, there is insufficient consideration of the role and function of Kings Langley in the wider sub-region. Both the Borough and Parish boundaries are tightly drawn – to the east by the Grand Union Canal and to the south by the M25. This is clearly acknowledged in paragraph 23.167 of the Growth Strategy. Despite this, and the statement that the Borough Council works closely with Three Rivers District Council to ensure a “consistent settlement-wide approach”, it is concluded that “we can only plan for the Dacorum part of the village.”</p> <p>The above statement is disappointing, as the Growth Strategy does not fully acknowledge the cross-boundary potential for development. In paragraph 23.176, it is stated that “<i>While there are reasonable levels of employment in the village, most of this is located in Three Rivers, which this Council has no planning control over.</i>” Although the strategy includes proposing a site (KL03) for employment uses at Sunderland’s Yard, Church Lane, there is no specific reference to potential sites for employment and housing which are in Three Rivers but adjacent to the village.</p> <p>As previously stated Three Rivers District Council will be seeking to maximise the areas of brown field land for housing development; in that respect, and an area of 30 hectares to the east of the Grand Union Canal is referred to as the Kings Langley Employment Area (KLEA). This represents over 60% of the Council’s Brown Field Register, and it is clear that the authority has a policy of converting employment sites in the KLEA to housing. A number of these employment sites in the KLEA have already been lost to 250+ housing units. These include Astra Zeneca, West Herts College, Shannon House, Pinnacle House, Primrose Hill (two sites). Conversion of many of these sites for housing will significantly increase</p>

pressures on infrastructure and services, most of which will gravitate towards the parish of Kings Langley on the west of the canal. Other sites were identified by Three Rivers District Council for thousands more houses on Green Belt sites bordering the KLEA.

For this reason, no further housing should be built on the Green Belt at Rectory Farm before there is clarity about how many more houses Three Rivers District Council plan for these Green Belt sites bordering the parish of Kings Langley.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12886

**Person ID** 1269665

**Full Name** Mr Martin Hicks

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment** Development in Kings Langley  
 This does not recognise the local food growing initiative at Rectory Farm. This and the river valley environment must be adequately addressed, otherwise the plan will not be sustainable.

**Included files**

**Title** Kings Langley Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13338

**Person ID** 1144584

**Full Name** Mr Gary Ansell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 I mention above that Kings Langley is split across two council areas – DBC &amp; TRDC. DBC has a duty to co-operate with TRDC and the plan states that DBC works closely with TRDC to ensure a “consistent settlement-wide approach” but then concludes “we can only plan for the Dacorum part of the village” (Kings Langley). How is that co-operating? How is DBC going to take into account what TRDC are planning in their Local Plan for the part of Kings Langley that falls under them? If there is no joined up strategy, how can DBC put forward a plan such as this and not understand the overall impact both local plans will have on Kings Langley? I do not believe the DBC Local Plan is sound in this respect and nor does it provide Kings Langley residents with any assurance that our village will not be turned into a town by excessive development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14472
<b>Person ID</b>	1171463
<b>Full Name</b>	Kings Langely & District Residents Association
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Kings Langley and District Residents association
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270673
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Jed Griffiths MA DipTP FRTPI
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1. This statement, made on behalf of Kings Langley &amp; District Residents Association (KL&amp;DRA), has been prepared by Jed Griffiths MA DipTP FRTPI and reviewed by Bernadette Hillman LLB Solicitor LARTPI .</p> <p>2. KL&amp;DRA is a non-profit organisation, set up to preserve and enhance the quality of life for residents in Kings Langley and the surrounding area. The KL&amp;DRA represents the views of a large proportion of Kings Langley residents.</p>

3. This statement has been prepared in response to the publication in November 2020 by Dacorum Borough Council of Dacorum: A Strategy for Growth {2023 - 2038} under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plans) (England) Regulations 2004.

4. KL&DRA acknowledges that publication of the growth strategy represents a stage in the review and replacement of the components of the adopted Dacorum Local Plan (as described in paragraph 1.18 of the consultation report). It welcomes the opportunity that the Borough Council has given to local communities to comment on the emerging approach to development prior to the pre-submission of the Local Plan under Regulation 19.

5. In formulating this response, KL&DRA has given careful consideration to the Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038) which sets out the preferred approach to accommodating growth across Dacorum, the sites which are proposed and the draft policies that will deliver them and manage development within the Borough. The Association has been assisted in its assessment by the supporting topic papers and other parts of the updated evidence base.

6. The main focus of this statement will be on the Kings Langley Delivery Strategy and site allocations, which are set out in Chapter 23 of the Growth Strategy. Nevertheless, some comments are made on the overall strategy and the context it provides for future development in Kings Langley. Where appropriate, reference will be made to KL&DRA's detailed representations to the Borough on the Issues and Options report in 2017 (Regulation 17 stage).

7. In summary and for the reasons set out below, the Borough Council is urged to withdraw this proposal, which is premature and to re-consider its strategy for Kings Langley in consultation with local stakeholders and Three Rivers District Council

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14979
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Kings Langley and Markyate are both settlements that are set along main rivers. We would like to be consulted on any masterplans/strategies for these areas.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Kings Langley Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15580
<b>Person ID</b>	1271579
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	BOYER PLANNING ON BEHALF OF W LAMB LTD
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Kings Langley Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the interests of the soundness of the Plan, to align with the other Delivering Growth Policies, there should be reference to the need for a Primary School site, given that there is already an under provision in the area. Land at Shendish, could meet this demand for school places.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	

# 23 Bovingdon Delivery Strategy responses

<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS64
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS160
<b>Person ID</b>	1161417
<b>Full Name</b>	James Pitt
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Gleeson Developments Limited
<b>Agent ID</b>	1161419
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Kevin Coleman
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

## **Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

As currently drafted, the Delivery Strategy for Bovingdon lacks any cohesive logical justification for the selected approach, key elements of it are considered undeliverable (including the suggested safeguarded school site and Site BV02 Chesham Road), and the evidence base is internally inconsistent and lacks credibility in key aspects, not least in respect of matters such as Green Belt impacts, accessibility by non-car modes, and heritage.

Our objections can be divided in to three main parts:

- Objection to the proposed allocation Bv01 in relation to Grange Farm;
- Objection to proposed allocation Bv02 in relation to Chesham Road; and
- Objection to the omission of the allocation of Duckhall Farm.

### **Objections to Site Bv01**

In relation to Bv01, the key flaw in the strategy is contained at paragraphs 23.190 and 23.191.

Paragraph 23.190 states that the Council has considered proposals for redevelopment of publically owned land in the centre of Bovingdon, and sets out that one of the benefits of this would be "the Bovingdon Primary Academy School could be relocated to a greenfield site (linked to the allocation at Grange Farm) to provide a purpose built and enlarged 3FE school ...".

Paragraph 23.191 however states that this proposal is not economically viable and cannot be delivered.

However, the Delivery Strategy nevertheless proceeds to allocate land at Grange Farm for development, and includes within that allocation a requirement for safeguarding 3ha of land for future education use (i.e. for a 3FE school).

It is therefore explicit that the justification for the allocation of the Grange Farm site is inextricably linked to the provision of land for a future 3FE school site, but this is clearly unsound because:

- (a) The Plan itself has confirmed that there is no known viable option for relocating the Primary School to Grange Farm, and therefore the ability or otherwise to safeguard land for a school site cannot be used in the site selection process;
- (b) At 150 units, the Grange Farm development would not, under the CIL Regulations, create a need for that development to provide land (let alone fund) a new 3FE school. As case law has previously shown, a statement in a Local Plan policy cannot make an unjustifiable infrastructure requirement justifiable under the CIL Regulations, and therefore irrespective of what the Council may wish to seek under allocation Bv01, it would not ultimately be able to require the developer of Grange Farm to safeguard land for a 3FE School because it is not a CIL compliant requirement for that development;
- (c) There is no necessity in any event for new development in Bovingdon to be linked to the relocation or expansion of the existing primary school, and therefore ultimately linking the consideration of site suitability and the scale of new development to alternative education provision is a false premise. During the summer of 2020, an evidence base document on school capacity in Bovingdon and the surrounding area was prepared by EFM on behalf of the main land promoters at Bovingdon and submitted to the Council. This evidence demonstrates that, in respect of primary provision, in the order of 600 new homes can be accommodated without needing any relocation or enlargement of Bovingdon Primary School because (i) using local demographic data (unlike the HCC Education Authority approach), the analysis shows that in the relevant Ward there is a falling birth rate which will create capacity and (ii) in any event, Bovingdon Primary School draws children from a wider catchment, and there is an ability to increase the capacity of schools elsewhere in the locality which



would effectively provide more capacity in locations already 'exporting' children to Bovingdon. This evidence is re-submitted as part of this response;

(d) The Council/Education Authority cannot have it both ways – if additional development in Bovingdon of the scale suggested (i.e. 240 or so new homes) requires additional land for primary school education purposes, then the Delivery Strategy would need to explain how (and when) that additional land is to be delivered. In this case, and notwithstanding our other points above), the strategy is based on *safeguarding* land for possible future use educational use. The fact that the Council is only looking to safeguard land against a possible future requirement, rather than requiring land now to accommodate the additional demand from circa 240 homes, proves in fact that there is no need for additional land to accommodate the increase in units, and in so doing, ironically also undermines the rationality for needing any safeguarded land, because if there is no identified need now arising from the proposed development, how can there be said to be a need to safeguarded land for the future? Either additional land for education is needed, or it is not. It is clear from this strategy that there is no such need, irrespective of the lack of any CIL compliant means of achieving it.

Fundamentally, then, the selection of Grange Farm as the most appropriate location for development based on an expected provision of a safeguarded school site is unsound, because that safeguarded school site is neither needed for the level of housing being sought on site Bv01, nor can it be secured.

The question therefore arises as to whether, in the absence of any relocation of the Primary School, the Bv01 site would still be selected as the most appropriate (or only) new allocation.

In the absence of the relocation of the Primary School, the Bv01 site displays a number of significant deficiencies when compared against the reasonable alternatives (including Duckhall Farm), most pertinently being:

- 1 With all of the key village facilities, including the Primary School, being contained within the High Street, site Bv01 is by some considerable margin the most remote from local services of all of the possible options considered by the Council through the site selection process. There is no direct pedestrian route to the village centre, and the existing pedestrian routes along the busy Chesham Road are in part narrow and unlit, as are parts of Green Lane. The site offers a particularly poor location for promoting non-car access to the village centre, and therefore its allocation will only exacerbate the concerns expressed locally by the Parish Council in respect of congestion in the High Street.

Given that congestion and parking are cited in the Development Strategy Topic Paper as the biggest constraints to growth in Bovingdon, it is inexplicable as to why the selected site allocation should be the furthest from the village centre, and the most likely to *increase* parking and congestion on the High Street. On the other hand, Duckhall Farm is adjacent to the shops and services, within easy walking distance, whilst the majority of traffic from the site would have no cause to enter or leave the village via the High Street.

- 1 The site is physically the largest of the alternative options considered, and compared to the alternatives, has the greatest negative impact in terms of the openness of the Green Belt. Duckhall Farm, by comparison, is already physically contained by existing built development comprising existing residential areas and the Prison, and its removal from the Green Belt would not physically enlarge the village beyond its existing broad extent, unlike Grange Farm.

- 2 In the absence of the unjustified 3ha of educational land, the Grange Farm site is far larger than is physically needed to accommodate 150 homes, and therefore is a wasteful release of Green Belt land which would require housing to be at an excessively low density, or otherwise would need the site to be illogically subdivided to provide only such land as would be needed for 150 units. At 10.11 ha of land, 150 homes would produce a development density of less than 15 dph. Even allowing for, say, a fifth of the site to be set aside for strategic open space and SuDs (i.e. 2 ha), the site would be achieving a net density of less than 19 dph, which is a hugely wasteful use of Green Belt land. For 150 units, the proposed site allocation is simply grossly too large.

Once the flawed premise of a relocated primary school site is removed from the equation, there is no sound basis for the proposed allocation of the Grange Farm site in advance of the more suitable and sustainable alternatives, and in particular the Duckhall Farm site.

### **Objections to site Bv02**

Turning to the Bv02 site, it is now some 10 years since the Chesham Road site was put forward as a development site in the Council's Core Strategy (originally for 60 units).

We noted at the Core Strategy Examination back in 2010/2 that there was a high risk that the site would not come forward for development, both because there was no evidence that the site could accommodate 60 units (evidently true, as this has now been reduced to 40), or that the site was developable at all in terms of being genuinely available and free of constraints, or that there would be any market interest, given its location on the entrance to the prison and the proximity to events on Bovingdon Airfield. The inclusion of a reservoir within the site and the lack of ability to provide a highway access to serve the site from Chesham Road are further factors that are likely to have reduced the capacity of the site and which affect the likelihood of it ever being delivered.

In a high value area such as Bovingdon, the fact that the site remains undeveloped 10 years after it was initially identified as a development plan site provides strong evidence to the effect that the site is not available and/or deliverable, and the allocation should be removed and replaced by a suitable alternative (i.e. the Duckhall Farm site).

### **Alternative Option – Duckhall Farm**

In relation to the Duckhall Farm alternative option, the Council has been provided with evidence relating to the availability, achievability and suitability of this site previously, and the suitability of the site has been discussed at length with Officers in the series of meetings held towards the end of 2019 and start of 2020, which were supported by technical evidence including highways pre-application advice and a heritage assessment, all of which demonstrates that the scheme was suitable and deliverable. Copies of previously supplied documentation can of course be resupplied.

In terms of suitability of the Duckhall Farm site, the evidence that we have supplied and discussed with Officers has drawn attention to:

- The fact that there are no environmental or technical constraints to development;
- The site is exceptionally well related to the existing village in terms of minimising impact on the Green Belt (it being bordered by the prison to the north and adjoining residential to the south). The conclusion by AECOM in the Site Assessment Study that development at Duckhall Farm would perform poorly in Green Belt terms (and that the

Grange Farm site would perform relatively well) is, in our opinion, frankly astounding, and serves to diminish the credibility of this aspect of the evidence base. For Grange Farm, the AECOM report suggests additional landscape screening would help in terms of setting, but there is plenty of scope for structural planting at Duckhall Farm, although at Duckhall Farm there is less need because the proposed development area is already very well contained;

- The development has the ability to include a package of compensatory Green Belt enhancement measures on adjoining land in the same ownership, including increased public access and biodiversity enhancement (this factor is not taken in to account in the AECOM Site Assessment Study);
- The site is highly sustainable (particularly compared to Grange Farm) given the proximity of the site to the High Street, which would help to minimise any impact from the development on congestion in the High Street (the relative sustainability of sites and the ability for access by non-car modes is only dealt with on a cursory basis in the AECOM Site Assessment Study and DBC assessment work);
- Importantly, traffic from the site entering or leaving the village would not need to travel through the High Street (we note that despite congestion in the High Street being cited as a key issue for Bovingdon, this factor is not considered in the Site Assessment Study by AECOM, or by DBC in its assessment work). The pre-application advice already received from the Highway Authority raises no concerns in respect of access to Duckhall Farm;
- In terms of Heritage Assets, the scale and layout of development is compatible with protecting the setting of the adjoining Listed Buildings. We note that the Design Case study included in Volume 2 of the AECOM Site Assessment Study supports our view on this by showing how heritage constraints can be addressed, but that analysis is then not factored in to the analysis in Volume 3 of the AECOM Study in relation to the site assessment, and therefore there is a clear 'disconnect' between the evidence presented by Volume 2 and Volume 3 of the AECOM work which undermines the credibility of this work. We note that in the DBC site assessment work, the Council agrees that matters of heritage impact can be successfully addressed, and therefore heritage impact should not be a factor that negatively reflects on the suitability of Duckhall Farm. We have already provided evidence in respect of the compatibility of development at Duckhall Farm proposals with the protection of heritage assets, in the form of previously submitted baseline Heritage Assessment. Alongside these representations we have re-submitted that Heritage Assessment, which now also includes an Addendum to explain how the AECOM design study supports the conclusions of our original report.
- As explained in the evidence that we have provided in respect of education, the development can be accommodated without the need for the primary school to be relocated.

It will be noted from the above that in presenting the positive aspects of the Duckhall Farm scheme, we have touched in part on flaws within the Evidence Base. In this regard, we would draw particular attention to the following:

- Sustainability Appraisal – When looking at the comparison of the different site options for Bovingdon at Table 5-8 on page 39 of the SA Report, it is evident that Duckhall Farm scores more highly than Grange Farm, even on the analysis presented. However, the SA analysis contains inaccuracies, not least in that it scores Duckhall Farm and Grange Farm equally in terms of accessibility by walking and cycling (as discussed above it is evident that in terms of ability to walk safely to shops and services, the Duckhall site is far superior), and because in respect of community cohesion, the Grange Farm site is credited because of the suggested delivery of the school site (when as we have identified this is not required or deliverable), whilst the Duckhall site is unreasonably marked with a negative score

because it is suggested that somehow its location with the grounds of the prison to the north could cause anxiety – not only is this wholly inconsistent with the allocation of The Mount, but there is no evidence whatsoever to back up this unusual hypothesis, it is pure and unjustified speculation. Therefore when read properly and when properly understood, it is clear that the Sustainability Appraisal supports Duckhall Farm over the alternatives, not Grange Farm;

- AECOM Site Assessment Study – A key flaw in the AECOM site assessment work is, as we have noted above, its wholly illogical conclusions and lack of rigour in respect of two key issues, namely Green Belt and heritage, as follows:
  - Green Belt – the conclusion that the site “performs very poorly in Green Belt terms” is simply not borne out either by the preceding analysis in the report, or by any objective analysis when the level of containment and relative position in respect of adjoining development are taken in to account. Moreover, this conclusion is wholly at odds with the analysis in the Sustainability Appraisal. The SA correctly identifies that Duckhall Farm has a “sense of enclosure” and separation from the wider landscape (i.e. in Green Belt terms it is more contained), and also correctly states in respect of Grange Farm that “development at this prominent location would extend Bovingdon into the countryside”, the AECOM report somehow contrives to come to the opposite conclusion and suggest that the Duckhall Farm site has the greater impact. This is nonsensical, and the two assessments are clearly at odds with each other;
  - Heritage – the AECOM study shows in Volume 2 that with a set-back to the adjoining Listed Buildings, heritage issues can be addressed, and yet still scores the Duckhall Farm negatively in this respect despite having identified and taken in to account the relevant mitigation. The negative conclusion in respect of heritage impact is therefore not internally consistent with the design work in Volume 2.
  - Accessibility – the AECOM report rightly notes that the Duckhall Farm site has “good” access to local facilities whereas the Grange Farm site has “reasonable” access. However, as per our previous comments, not only is the assessment of “reasonable” in respect of Grange Farm highly questionable given the lack of lit and convenient routes, the AECOM appraisal does not properly grasp the significance of the distinction that it makes in this regard – that one site is likely to promote safe walking and cycling in to the village centre and therefore not exacerbate congestion on the High Street, and the other is likely to generate frequent local car trips to the High Street because the options for walking and cycling are on;t, at best. “reasonable”.
- DBC Site Selection Topic Paper – the DBC site assessment report contains many of the same flaws as the AECOM report, but also relies on erroneous conclusions regarding infrastructure delivery. Particular comments at this stage include:
  - Green Belt – the DBC assessment of relative impact on Green Belt relies primarily on the findings of the wider Green Belt study and the way that assessment considered wider land parcels in terms of Green Belt purposes. As we have repeatedly pointed out, at the site selection stage, sites need to be assessed in terms of their actual individual impact on the Green Belt, not the impact of the wider parcel of land assessed for the purposes of the Green Belt study. It is the parcel of land that is proposed for removal from the Green Belt where the impact occurs, not the remainder of the strategic parcel, and therefore reliance on the wider strategic assessment is flawed. On a like for like basis, looking at land take and impact on the openness of the Green

Belt around Bovingdon, there is no doubt that Grange Farm has the larger adverse impact (a conclusion that is supported by the findings of the SA, as discussed above);

- Heritage – as with the AECOM study, the DBC assessment identifies that mitigation can be provided to address the impact on heritage assets, indeed it goes further and accepts explicitly that heritage impacts can be sufficiently mitigated and indeed that in some respects the setting of heritage assets could be enhanced, but then (a) makes the erroneous comment that this may affect development quantum, which ignores the AECOM capacity study which shows this is not the case and (b) still refers to potential adverse heritage impact in the conclusion, which is not borne out by the analysis presented;
- Accessibility – the DBC study correctly identifies that the Duckhall Farm site “is in reasonable proximity to existing services and facilities on Bovingdon High Street”, but, as with the AECOM and SA work, fails to spot the inherent difficulties in providing safe and secure pedestrian routes between the High Street and Grange Farm, in addition to failing to address the relative distance that Grange Farm lies from the main village services;
- Undeliverable Infrastructure – Fundamentally, the selection of Grange Farm appears to have been based in large part upon an expectation of benefits arising from that scheme which cannot be secured, or which do not actually provide any wider benefit. In particular, we have noted that the attempt to secure a 3FE primary school site will fail because there is no need for such a site and it cannot be legally bound under the CIL Regulations. In respect of the alleged drainage benefits, the same issues apply – any ‘over extra’ benefit in terms of existing drainage conditions would be minimal as the performance requirement for any drainage scheme in this instance is nil net detriment i.e. no greater than greenfield run-off, and any attempt to impose a higher requirement to satisfy wider existing issues will not be legally enforceable. Finally the proposed ‘park’ in this location would have limited wider benefit to the village as the site is so peripheral to the majority of existing residents.

As the above shows, the Council is essentially relying on three different pieces of work in respect of site selection – the SA, the AECOM analysis, and its own analysis. The three different pieces of work provide inconsistent pieces of analysis in key respects, but all of them suffer deficiencies. In some cases the deficiencies are common to all (for example the lack of appreciation as to what the difficulties of providing safe and convenient pedestrian access to Grange Farm means in practice). In some cases the deficiencies are internal to the individual studies (conclusions not reflecting the preceding analysis). In some cases the deficiencies relate to the lack of consistent findings (the manner in which Green Belt impacts are considered, for example). The combination however is a flawed and inconsistent evidence base that does not support the chosen approach to site selection.

In our view, once the errors in the evidence base are corrected, the Duckhall Farm site should rightly be assessed as being preferable in terms of both its suitability for development and its inherent sustainability, compared to Grange Farm and Chesham Road.

Finally, in terms of the availability and deliverability of the Duckhall Farm site, we would note that it has the benefit of being in single ownership and under the control of a land promoter with a track record of delivery. Gleeson has undertaken research on a number of sites it has sold over the past four years which shows that on sites of less than 100 dwellings, the average timescale from Outline approval to start on site is 19 months, and this delivery programme is assisted by

the technical and pre-planning work that Gleeson put in place on all of their disposals. In terms of achievability and delivery, the size of the Duckhall Farm scheme lends itself to a relatively short build out period, with an expectation that the site would be delivered within 18 months to 24 months from commencement, particularly given local market conditions, and given the lack of any onerous technical or environmental issues. Finally we note that the Council's viability assessment work confirms that development would be viable, a conclusion we agree with.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">2021.02.16 - Bovingdon A3 Heritage Statement (with 2021 Adendum) 0062.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS236
<b>Person ID</b>	1258552
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Conradi
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please see my comments on the infrastructure section which are entirely relevnt here
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS384
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260042
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Mitchell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Redbourn Parish Council

Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS480
<b>Person ID</b>	1258240
<b>Full Name</b>	Adele Giles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS534
<b>Person ID</b>	1260834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Alison Banister
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am sure I commented on the planned development for Bovingdon, but not sure what is being done regarding development of the supporting infrastructure, to include roads, GP surgeries, local hospitals, dentists and schools. Our GP surgery is overloaded as is Watford General hospital (WGH). There isn't currently enough parking for staff &amp; visitors, let alone enough beds!</p> <p>I live in Bovingdon, where unlawful parking is an issue and only once in 34 years, has a traffic warden issued fines.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS642
<b>Person ID</b>	1261183
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Fairfull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.</p> <p>My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.</p> <p>The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.</p> <p>Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity? You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is</p>



currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan. It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.

Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.

These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.

In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS660

**Person ID** 1261122

**Full Name** Mark Slade

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS903
<b>Person ID</b>	1163249
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Owens
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I should like to comment on the proposed Dacorum Local Plan 2020-38. I live in Bovingdon and am concerned that the proposed plan does not take sufficient account of the current situation in the village whereby the infrastructure is already stretched and additional pressure would be unsustainable. The High Street is congested by local traffic and especially by through traffic of HGVs. The B4505 Chesham – Boxmoor road is increasingly congested and frequent road works add to the traffic delays. The local school is at capacity.</p> <p>Building additional homes on Green Belt land would open the way to unsustainable development that the village could not assimilate. Please ensure that any development is modest, sustainable and regulated.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1172
<b>Person ID</b>	1143779

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Julia Marshall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	23.183 Development should be at a minimal level to reflect the constraints of its location and services. The lack of infrastructure needs to be addressed by DBC notwithstanding the smaller number of homes planned. 23.184 I should like to see greater cooperation and support from DBC to assist Bovingdon in delivering their Neighbourhood Plan in a timely manner.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1289
<b>Person ID</b>	1259116
<b>Full Name</b>	Tring in Transition (TinT)
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1929

<b>Person ID</b>	1262553
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Wallis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2143
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2165
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286

<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2430
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2617
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3443
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>The Plan states:  “23.182 To the south east of the village lies Bovingdon Green, Bovingdon Football Club and Bovingdon &amp; Flaunden Tennis Club, which provide important sources of outdoor recreation space and sports facilities for the village.”</p> <p><i>The significant increase in population that will result from the plan may put considerable pressure on the existing sports clubs in Bovingdon. Consideration should be given to the future expansion of the facilities for/by these clubs and the identification of sites and opportunities for further sporting facilities development in Bovingdon.</i></p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS3746
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3774
<b>Person ID</b>	1260834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Alison Banister
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am sure I commented on the planned development for Bovingdon, but not sure what is being done regarding development of the supporting infrastructure, to include roads, GP surgeries, local hospitals, dentists and schools. Our GP surgery is overloaded as is Watford General hospital (WGH). There isn't currently enough parking for staff &amp; visitors, let alone enough beds!</p> <p>I live in Bovingdon, where unlawful parking is an issue and only once in 34 years, has a traffic warden issued fines. Are you able to point me in the right direction for a document that shows any of these issues being addressed?</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3991
<b>Person ID</b>	1261840
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4020
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4467
<b>Person ID</b>	1160525
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Hislam
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Development in Bovingdon</u></p> <p>The village requires a new Parish Hall that will cater better for mixed use, storage, ad-hoc events, and social meetings. This should include better facilities for the young, especially teenagers who presently have inadequate places to meet and socialise.</p> <p>Bovingdon Academy School (both nursery and primary) should not be moved from its present location. A re-modelling of the frontage along the High Street could better serve school drop-offs and pick-ups.</p> <p>The High Street must have improved provisions for parking. The most effective way of arranging this is to adopt a chevron style bay orientation that would allow more vehicles to both park and access / exit more safely from the bays. In the village centre there is ample scope to allow this on both sides of the street. This would allow a traffic calming road layout to be created.</p> <p>The 1st Bovingdon Scout Group are in desperate need of a new H/Q building and have been using the grounds of the Scout Hut for meetings throughout lock down but have not used the hut itself for 5 years. They have raised over £20,000 towards rebuilding costs. The new Scout HQ will not only be used for young people in the village but also the other organisations that had used it previously. There is a shortage of these facilities in Bovingdon and they are much needed. I think that they may wish to keep their existing site as it is important for their outdoor activities.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4539
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5167
<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5302
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5502
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5527
<b>Person ID</b>	1264048
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Both the main 'growth areas' for Bovingdon are green field / green belt land and should not be built on until all 'brownfield' sites throughout Dacorum have been built on first.</p> <p>What are you doing to make sure that the new homes are built where they are most needed in Dacorum and are of the type needed; and not just where the developer believes they will make the most profit?</p> <p><b>"23.185</b> At least 240 homes will be provided over the period 2020-2038." We have already had leaflets with a proposed plan for 150 of the new homes at Grange Farm, through the door from a developer. It looks like developers are 'cherry picking' the sites where they will get the most profit; which are unlikely to be the same sites where the new homes are most needed. Affordable homes are needed throughout Dacorum; and developers who are profit driven, will provide the least that they can get away with. Other less profitable potential sites where affordable homes are needed and may be provided less expensively in Dacorum, will be left till last. If these 'affordable' homes are available to buy; how will you ensure they remain affordable for the next purchaser?</p> <p>How will new housing address the 'congestion on Bovingdon High Street'? It will only add to this. The new developments will be a 10 to 15 minute walk from the High Street which will mean that many new residents will use their cars, increasing congestion.</p> <p>"The village has recently benefited from the provision of a new Tesco Metro store on the edge of the centre." There is insufficient parking for this shop and a new development will worsen antisocial parking and cause more congestion in the High Street.</p> <p>"In particular, land on the High Street (linked to proposals at Grange Farm) offers opportunities to deliver a package of housing, parking and community benefits" I have been told that a new school at Grange Farm (which would free up land for a car park on the High Street) has no realistic prospect of materialising. Therefore, the new development will not provide any offset on the local infrastructure but only add to it. It is very misleading to state otherwise and say land is being reserved for a school; when one is not going to be built.</p> <p>There has been no associated promise to build a safe walking and cycling route to Hemel Hempstead Station, which is about 2 miles away. This has been previously been mooted as needing to be provided as a benefit to the village; to offset the negative impact of housing development.</p> <p>The developer also stated that they will correct flooding issues on the Moody Estate. I am not aware of any homes being flooded on the Moody Estate. I would also be concerned that 150 new homes and the associated roads will add to any drainage issues.</p>

The proposed Grange Farm development is next to Boxmoor Trust land. When I went on a tour with the Boxmoor Trust 18 months ago, the man said that the former brickworks is their most diverse site and has some rare butterflies. I wonder what rare species Grange Farm has. We often hear owls at night. Building at Grange Farm will impact on wildlife and is why brownfield sites throughout Dacorum must be exhausted before Green field and Green belt land are used.

It is important that the Bovingdon Neighbourhood plan is up and running, before developers are invited to start proposing plans.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5563

**Person ID** 1264491

**Full Name** Paul Wade

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5691

**Person ID** 1262957

**Full Name** Gregory Hukins

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5773
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5905
<b>Person ID</b>	1264752
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6176
<b>Person ID</b>	1144698
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Joanne Bain
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>This strategy provides housing for the village away from its already congested centre which is important. Bovingdon village infrastructure is currently at breaking point and its core - around the High Street, its Conservation Area and the land centred around the Ryder Memorial at the junction of the High Street and Green Lane - is already too congested.</p> <p>Using the land of the existing school in the High Street for parking and a greener, more community focused heart to the village would be a benefit to residents and shop owners alike - the school would benefit from modern buildings and facilities on the Grange Farm site. This development also promises to tackle the drainage issues that have bugged Bovingdon for years, especially where Green Lane joins the Ley Hill Road.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6266
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6296
<b>Person ID</b>	1262718
<b>Full Name</b>	Clare Norton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a Bovingdon resident and Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Housing Working Group, I welcome the proposals for Bovingdon. They are proportionate to the size of the village and will provide some opportunity to invest in the village infrastructure.</p> <p>I am however uncomfortable about the proposed re-location of the Primary School out of the village centre, albeit not until after the Local Plan timeline in 2038. I feel this would take the soul from the village and while the school does need more space it may be possible to achieve this on the existing envelope with parking and enhanced outdoor facilities. By combining the land of the school, the Scout Hut, the Memorial Hall and the King George V playing fields, there is an opportunity to provide parking, a larger hall and an all weather pitch. This would be possible much earlier than 2038 and would allow the school to comply with national school space standards which as former Chair of the Governors at the school, I am aware the school falls short on. This would improve the school facilities and develop higher quality community assets for the village and the scouts. It would also protect the Springfield nature reserve as part of the school grounds.</p>



The village is in need of better facilities for young people, which the scouts could provide in a young persons resource centre. I would like to see all the parties come together to make a plan for the village centre, and for the Parish Council to coordinate this. I am currently the Chair of 1st Bovingdon Scouts and we would very much support such a plan.

The Scout HQ was a temporary building from the early 1970s and has now been declared obsolete. Scouts are fundraising to replace the HQ with the support of HCC, the landowner. If all parties came together there would be a higher probability of developing a viable plan with the funding to achieve this.

In terms of the proposed housing developments, I would like to see any new development complement and reflect the surrounding area. Bovingdon is a rural community surrounded by rolling fields and woodland. I would like to see the three proposed developments at Grange Farm, Molyneux Avenue and The Bobsleigh be developed at no greater density than 30 dph to stay in keeping with the rest of the area. A mix of affordable and for sale housing would be desirable and would fit in well with the mixed community which is Bovingdon. Any development at a higher density would also run the risk of over populating the village for the Primary school. The Housing Needs Survey we have undertaken shows a need for a range of accommodation from local people from 1 and 2 beds to older persons accomodation and 3 and 4 bedroom family accommodation.

There is a great opportunity to find a lasting solution to the congestion and poor planning in the High Street which could provide solutions sooner than 2038, and I recommend to DBC that we all fully explore this.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS6412

**Person ID** 1264750

**Full Name** Neil Joyce

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS6507
<b>Person ID</b>	1264952
<b>Full Name</b>	Graham Bund
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Grange Farm Developement - Having looked at the suggested areas that could be expanded this seems to be the best and most logical one. It will keep any additional traffic away from the main village and not add to the pollution and noise levels for local residents.</p> <p>However, we are aware that another Developer has been lobbying residents in the local area with a proposed plan for Louise Walk off Green Lane. We live in Homefield and believe the additional traffic in Green Lane would have a major negative impact to the area. The road is not particularly wide and already has problems with cars parked in the road making it difficult to navigate and it gets congested. Any developments that consider navigating out from the minor roads in the lower part of Green Lane towards the High Street would be cause for concern as there would surely be a safety issue due to lack of space and vision of oncoming traffic. The grass verges on Homefield and along Green Lane are already churned up by traffic due to the narrow road.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6627
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6817
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7032
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7082
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7453
<b>Person ID</b>	1265390
<b>Full Name</b>	Sylvia and Peter McClelland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

As part of the consultation for the present local plan Dacorum Council issued a document itemising the opportunities for housing development in the villages within the Dacorum area.

The comment on Bovingdon stated that

**- There is traffic congestion in the High Street, with access to the few parking spaces regularly blocked by deliveries to the shops**

**There are few opportunities for work in the village so long traffic queues build up in Box Lane as people drive to work in Hemel Hempstead or to the station,**

**dwellings over the period'**

Since then there has been no improvement in the infrastructure and infilling has resulted in several hundred more homes, greatly increasing the traffic problems i.e.

- B4505 which leads to Boxmoor and Hemel Hempstead and is the busiest B road in the

The road to Chesham which also carries the traffic to the Mount Prison

- Chipperfield Road which is the route to Kings Langley and Watford

These roads were not designed to carry large volumes of traffic and there is a history of long hold-ups particularly on the B4505 at peak hours and frequently for repairs. At present the B4505 is closed for many weeks for repair.

To avoid the congestion the traffic diverts down the minor lanes which are narrow and dangerous with few passing places .

The Green Belt was designed to protect the countryside from urban sprawl. Bovingdon was specified as a specified Development within the Green Belt in the 1970's and the substantial growth since then has taken place within the Green Belt boundary. I was told by a planning inspector at one enquiry that Bovingdon has the least public recreational space in proportion to the population in the county. Further development would make this worse.

As a Bovingdon resident I can find no specific proposals in the Emerging Strategy for Growth documents other than on the Draft Proposals Map where two sites in the Green Belt, Molyneux Avenue and Grange Farm are indicated. I understand that there is a provisional figure of 60 homes on the Molyneux site and 150 homes on the Grange Farm site. This contravenes the statement in Parliament that building in the Green Belt will not be allowed. If granted permission, these sites would be used as a precedent for a host of applications from owners of sites in the Green Belt on the outskirts of the village. There are many sites within the core of the village which have development planning permission which

- will satisfy current demand for the period of the new Local Plan.

. Please maintain the present Green Belt boundary round Bovingdon and only allow development within that boundary.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7803

<b>Person ID</b>	1148738
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian and Claire Field
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	(23) Delivery Strategy – flawed windfall calculations and projections leads to a faulty delivery strategy that prioritises building on Green Belt, especially surrounding Berkhamsted, Tring and Bovingdon, over brownfield (for example Bovingdon Airfield continues to be undeveloped for housing despite the majority of the land being unused) and urban development (contrary to NPPF), and all the while holding back the bulk of the Hemel Garden Communities allocation until after the Plan. This is totally illogical. Many of the Delivery Strategies, such as those for Berkhamsted and Bovingdon, are clearly developer led and offer no protection to Green Belt or infrastructure improvements for issues that already exist. In the case of Bovingdon, the proposed site at Grange Farm will build 150+ homes on agricultural land with questionable affordability of homes (if recent developments are anything to go by), next to a confirmed Nature Reserve at the old Brickworks Site, and with no confirmed provision of new amenities.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8336
<b>Person ID</b>	1266196
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREA DA CASA
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

The Green Belt Boundary on the South West Side of Chipperfield Road Bovingdon to the rear of The Close (32/34 Chipperfield Road).

I would like to propose that the green belt boundary on the south western side of the land at the rear of The Close, Bovingdon is moved to a point where it aligns with the green belt boundary to Austins Mead.

The green belt boundary surrounding this site is described by Dacorum Borough Council in it's Stage 3 Green Belt review Final report, as an Anomaly, and I believe this to be true.

The current boundary is not safe, the Inspector's Report of 2002 paragraph 4.27.24 states "that a well established hedge forms the boundary with the existing properties fronting Chipperfield Road..." but the boundary runs partly through the middle of the hedge and partly alongside it and parts of the hedge are missing altogether.

He goes on to say that "the South Western boundary is fronted by a mature row of trees" and in paragraph 4.27.26 that he " accepts that this line of trees would form a recognisable alternative boundary ".

I therefore submit that moving the green belt boundary to run with this line of trees along the South West boundary of the site would be far safer and more permanent and I would add that neither moving the green belt boundary on the site the other side of Austins Mead nor infilling the corners of Austins Mead itself has led to Urban Sprawl.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8714
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Children’s Services</u>. Development proposed within Bovingdon during the plan period amounts to an increase of 190 dwellings on two separate allocations and further developments arising from windfall and existing developments, which are, at this time, expected to be approximately 50 dwellings. This amounts to an additional child yield of 58fe when using the county council’s tiered approach to pupil yield,</p> <p>The county council considers that there is currently no feasible option in accommodating the additional child yield arising from these developments at a primary level. Should the amount of development be reduced to a total under 175 dwellings (inclusive of windfall and commitments), demand could likely be met at the local school, Bovingdon Demand for additional secondary school places are to be met in new schools located in Hemel Hempstead</p> <p><u>Lead Local Flood Authority</u>. The development strategy for Bovingdon, which is to include the reduction of flood risk is noted. The implications of this need to be identified for the Grange Farm development, either within the local plan, or the SFRA level 2</p> <p><u>Children’s Services</u>. This paragraph states that the Bovingdon Primary Academy School could be relocated to a greenfield site (linked to the allocation at Grange Farm), in order to provide a purpose-built and enlarged 3FE school’. The county council does not support this proposal, as there would be a large funding gap which would mean the relocation is</p> <p><u>Transport</u>. Directly identifying parking within this paragraph is contrary to HCC’s adopted It is considered that if the LPA is looking to enhance accessibility of the town centre this can and should be achieved via a number of methods including walking and cycling access (and cycle parking).</p> <p>Increasing walking access throughout the village (and walking/cycling access to local employment areas) should be an ambition, and with the level of development coming a high-quality change to the village could be achieved.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10434
<b>Person ID</b>	1268442
<b>Full Name</b>	NICHOLAS UNDERHILL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p> <p>Include names of all adults who wish to support BRAG.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10435
<b>Person ID</b>	1268444
<b>Full Name</b>	JULIE UNDERHILL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>

Include names of all adults who wish to support BRAG.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10436

**Person ID** 1268445

**Full Name** OLIVER UNDERHILL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

Please take this email as our formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.

Include names of all adults who wish to support BRAG.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10671

**Person ID** 1268742

**Full Name** Ross Dorras

**Organisation Details** Group Scout Leader  
1st Bovingdon Scout Group

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please accept my response to the above, as Group Scout Leader I am responding on behalf of 1st Bovingdon Scout Group. I feel many more off the over sixty families involved in Beavers, Cubs and Scouts in Bovingdon would have responded had the planning portal not been so difficult to navigate through and use.</p> <p>As the Group Scout Leader for 1st Bovingdon Scouts I would like to comment on Draft Local Plan section 23.185 Bovingdon Delivery Plan. Our present Scout Hut is in St Lawrence Close, Bovingdon HP3 0LS and is in need of rebuilding. Previously it was used by many organisations in the village and our Beaver, Cub and Scout Groups are one of the few organisations providing for the interests of younger people in Bovingdon. Facilities in Bovingdon are very limited and it is almost impossible to get any new regular bookings for groups in the Memorial hall. There is an immediate need for facilities for youngsters in Bovingdon and I feel the plan makes no realistic attempt to help with this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11047
<b>Person ID</b>	1160525
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Hislam
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Memorial Hall:</p> <p>The village requires a new Parish Hall that will cater better for mixed use, storage, room rental, ad-hoc events, and social meetings. This should include better facilities for the young, especially teenagers who presently have inadequate places to meet and socialise.</p>

## High Street:

The High Street must be improved. The shops in our village offer an excellent variety of services, and food of superior standard as compared to other surrounding villages. However, the central village area is plain and has a run-down look with poor quality pavements and parking areas. There is no sense of village pride. There is a strong feeling amongst many parishioners that the area should be changed and improved. The Parish Council held a public meeting several years ago to announce that such an improvement plan was being prepared. To date, no improvements have been announced and none commenced.

The problems with the main shopping area are largely due to the inefficient manner of car parking and shop delivery arrangements. At school times the parking becomes over-crowded and traffic becomes backed up. This type of problem is exacerbated if a delivery is being made to the shops, the worst example is that to the Coop.

Improved provisions for parking should be adopted. The most effective way of arranging this is to adopt a chevron style bay orientation that would allow more vehicles to both park and access / exit more safely from the bays. In the village centre there is ample scope to allow this on both sides of the street. This would allow a traffic calming road layout to be created.

The approximate width of the high street in this area, between shop fronts, is 23 metres. At the Coop side of the road, there is a pavement 2 metres wide, the main parking area 8 metres, and the road pavement of 1.5 metres. The road is 6.5 metres in width. At the other side of the road there is generally a 5 metre-wide pavement. The shop frontages / parking lengths on either side of the road are both about 34 metres. All these dimensions are approximate. The ground is generally level in this area.

The present parking arrangements are perpendicular / normal to the road on the Coop side and parallel on the other side. Between the Post Office and Jarman's store, around 16 cars can park, 10 on the Coop side and 6 along the Post Office side. The standard UK design size for car parking bays is 2.4 metres by 4.8 metres. It is suggested that chevron style parking would provide parking bays with safer entry and especially egress for drivers. The overall number of parking places would remain similar or marginally greater than the present arrangements but would be more orderly and a more pleasing arrangement. In addition, the re-styled pavements along the shop fronts could provide amenity value for planters, pram and cycle racks and seating etc.

The road carriageway would require to be moved towards the Coop side of the area by approximately 5 metres. This zig-zag would instil traffic calming to this pedestrian area and provide a safer environment. Other areas further along the High Street could also be used for additional chevron parking spaces.

Bovingdon Academy:

Bovingdon Academy (both nursery and primary) should not be moved from its present location. A re-modelling of the frontage along the High Street could better serve school drop-offs and pick-ups.

Many people in Bovingdon are of the opinion that the Academy should remain on the present site, but the emphasis should be on increasing and improving parking along the high street. Without the Academy in the village centre, not only would the shops viability suffer but Bovingdon would lose its heart.

The concept of converting the library to classrooms has merit, and it is a great shame that when the library was first built it was not a 2-storey building. It may well be possible to modify this building to 2 storeys by replacing the roof with a timber framed first floor and roof.

I have researched the King George V Playing Field to find out how exactly it is “protected”. There are many of them around the UK. I found it a mystery that whenever anybody spoke of the field, the conversation stopped because of its “protected status”. I have contacted ‘Fields in Trust’ and their Development Manager advised that if part of the field were to be adopted as an additional play area for the Academy it would be possible, subject to their Trustees decision. There is precedent for this. The manner surfacing of such area is not in question.

This would allow Bovingdon Academy to use part of the field to allow the existing play area to be used for additional teaching facilities as and when enlargement of the school become necessary. This would be by far, be the most financially sensible option and allow the Academy to continue to be located near the centre of the Parish.

Allotments:

Despite there being a statutory requirement to provide these within the Parish, nothing has been made available since, what I understand was, the removal of same when the prison was built. Our local Horticultural Society has campaigned for this since that time but meets with the same answer on every occasion. It is known that the land adjacent the entrance to Little Hay golf course is a possibility. This needs to be actioned.

The Bovingdon Scouts:

The 1st Bovingdon Scout Group are in desperate need of a new H/Q building and have been using the grounds of the Scout Hut for meetings throughout lockdown but have not used the hut itself for 5 years. They have raised over £20,000 towards rebuilding costs. The new Scout HQ will not only be used for young people in the village but also the other

organisations that had used it previously. There is a shortage of these facilities in Bovingdon and they are much needed. I think that they may wish to keep their existing site as it is important for their outdoor activities.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11118

**Person ID** 1268947

**Full Name** Mrs Natasha Faccini

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

We are writing as parents of a child who is a member of 1st Bovingdon Cub Scouts.

We would like to see a draft allocation of land off Louise Walk, Green Lane as part of the local plan. We were impressed by the consideration that Thakeham have given the proposed allocation and in particular the provision of a new Scout hut.

Our daughter has been in the Cubs for a few years and it has been such a shame that they have not been able to meet in the current Scout hut, due to its current state of disrepair. Despite the efforts of all within the Scouts (across all age groups), it still seems like rebuilding our current site is some years away. So we were really grateful to see that a Scout hut would be built and gifted to 1st Bovingdon. This really is wonderful and will have such benefits, such as creating a sense of belonging among all the Beavers, Cubs and Scouts.

Further, the whole development seems really well-thought out, particularly the ideas around sustainable homes and biodiversity.

As a family, we whole-heartedly support this proposed allocation. We understand that Bovingdon has been earmarked for new housing and we would like to see a development succeeding that has actually thought about both the community and the environment we live in.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11329

**Person ID** 1269004

**Full Name** Mr Kevin Coleman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

As currently drafted, the Delivery Strategy for Bovingdon lacks any cohesive logical justification for the selected approach, key elements of it are considered undeliverable (including the suggested safeguarded school site and Site BV02 Chesham Road), and the evidence base is internally inconsistent and lacks credibility in key aspects, not least in respect of matters such as Green Belt impacts, accessibility by non-car modes, and heritage.

Our objections can be divided in to three main parts:

- Objection to the proposed allocation Bv01 in relation to Grange Farm;
- Objection to proposed allocation Bv02 in relation to Chesham Road; and
- Objection to the omission of the allocation of Duckhall Farm.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS11465

**Person ID** 1269106

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs David & Elizabeth Hobson

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We wish to strongly object to the subject plan for building in Bovingdon and for the impact on the Green Belt.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11466
<b>Person ID</b>	1269106
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs David & Elizabeth Hobson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>GREEN BELT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The Plan will desecrate the Green Belt around the village which is established to protect the countryside from over development and as a consequence will set a dangerous precedent in future planning applications.</li> <li>2 The <b>Prime Minister</b> has categorically stated to Parliament that under the National Planning Policy Framework there will be <b>no building on Green Belt</b>.</li> <li>3 Similarly the <b>Minister for Communities</b> under whom the responsibility for the Framework resides has also stated in support of the PM that the <b>Green Belt is sacrosanct</b>.</li> <li>4 The Framework also states Local authorities must take into account <b>constraints such as areas protected by the green belt</b> and without compromising environmental protection.</li> </ol>



These points suggest that DBC are not in a position to proceed until all these issues are satisfactorily addressed and published.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12888

**Person ID** 1269665

**Full Name** Mr Martin Hicks

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment** Development in Bovingdon at Grange Farm is immediately adjacent to an important Local Wildlife Site associated with the former brickworks and managed by Boxmoor Trust. Unless this is adequately considered to reduce damaging impacts from disturbance, the plan will not be sustainable.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13420

**Person ID** 1270229

**Full Name** Homes England

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1270231

**Agent Full Name** Ms  
Rebecca  
Dewey

**Agent Organisation** Associate Director  
WSP

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Whilst we largely agree with the delivery strategy for Bovingdon as a large village, as outlined in our response to the proposed policies, there are elements of the strategy that require amendment to comply with the tests of the NPPF. The following section provides policy justification relevant to the development of site ref. Bv02 – Chesham Road and Molyneux Avenue, Bovingdon. It proposes amendments to the draft wording of Chapter 23 below, highlighted in red.</p> <p>Paragraph</p> <p>Proposed changes</p> <p>Proposed benefit</p> <p>23.185</p> <p>At least <del>240</del> 260 homes will be provided over the period 2020-2038. The compact and built-up nature of Bovingdon limits opportunities for development on previously developed land in the settlement area. Nevertheless, there is scope for some of the latter through the redevelopment opportunities on the High Street and on the former Bobsleigh Hotel to the north east of the village. In addition, land is allocated within the village for <del>40</del> 60 homes on a site off Chesham Road and adjacent to the prison site (Bv02).</p> <p>The amendment will support the Council’s housing delivery targets, as well as correctly representing the deliverable scale of the site.</p> <p>23.195</p> <p>The airfield accommodates an air traffic navigation beacon. The area surrounding the beacon will need to be safeguarded from development and <del>development heights will be informed by the relevant allocation</del> development heights will be informed by consultation with NATS. The Council will also pay careful attention to the <del>height restrictions</del> height limit triggers over the remainder of the safeguarding zone in consultation with NATS and the Civil Aviation Authority.</p> <p>The amendment will support the Council’s correct implementation of the NATS consultation zones in Bovingdon, ensuring that development is not incorrectly restricted. As such, its amendment would seek to secure the soundness of the Plan, in accordance with Paragraph 35b of the NPPF.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15032
<b>Person ID</b>	1270846
<b>Full Name</b>	PETER ATKIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	ASSOCIATE

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>3.0</b> In light of the above representations to Q2, the delivery strategy stated in Policy SP26 (Delivering Growth in Bovingdon) is questioned. The Local Plan, as a whole, has not identified a sufficient level of housing growth to meet the needs of the Borough. Further allocations are therefore needed to help make up the shortfall and Bovingdon is evidently capable and suitable to support additional sustainable growth. The Council's own evidence demonstrates that of the available sites in Bovingdon which have not been allocated, land at Homefield is equally as suitable and sustainable as Land at Grange Farm (Site Bv01) which has been proposed for allocation. The site specifics will be discussed in response to Q5 below.</p> <p><b>3.1</b> Moreover, Land at Homefield is being promoted by Taylor Wimpey, one of the UK's largest national housebuilders and the Council can therefore have comfort that Taylor Wimpey's primary business model is to deliver high-quality homes to support thriving communities. Land at Homefield is therefore plainly capable of assisting Dacorum in meeting its housing needs in the early part of the plan period and Taylor Wimpey remains committed to continuing its engagement with the Council to ensure the prompt delivery of all their land interests within the Borough.</p> <p><b>3.2</b> With regards to local infrastructure, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2020) identifies a lack of movement by sustainable means due to infrequent bus services in Bovingdon. The development of additional sites such as land at Homefield will therefore further assist in creating the critical mass required and support more frequent services through the provision of appropriate contributions, thereby further improving the sustainability of Bovingdon as a whole.</p> <p><b>3.3</b> The Infrastructure Delivery Plan also identifies the requirement for an additional primary school to mitigate education capacity issues in Bovingdon. Grange Farm (Site Bv01) is proposed to safeguard 3ha of land for the delivery of a new Primary School. However, there is currently limited evidence in the Delivery Plan demonstrating the need for additional education capacity to meet need arising in Bovingdon itself and should safeguarded land for education be required then this will require a larger quantum of growth in Bovingdon to be viable. It is considered that further investigation is necessary by Dacorum and</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council in this regard.</p>

**3.4** Taylor Wimpey in association with other developers has previously submitted the enclosed Education Report (EFM, July 2020) (**Appendix 1**) to Dacorum which investigated education capacity in Bovington. The assessment highlights that sufficient capacity exists for the necessary education provision arising from additional dwellings in Bovington. This includes much higher growth than is currently proposed by the Local Plan.

**3.5** The education assessment shows that current primary school capacity is being filled by students with home addresses outside Bovington. As such, rather than allocating land for an additional school in Bovington, it would appear more logical to expand provision in the area those students are travelling from, which would in turn create sufficient capacity for students living in Bovington, even allowing for additional residential growth in the village.

**3.6** The enclosed education assessment further illustrates that, when declining local birth rates are taken into account, there exists sufficient primary school places within Bovington Ward to accommodate demand from over 600 new homes. Therefore, were new education provision to be directed to those areas in most need (i.e. to address existing deficiencies elsewhere), it is evident that Bovington is capable of supporting much higher levels of growth than is currently being planned for. The Education Assessment further confirms that ample secondary school capacity exists to meet increased levels of housing growth in Bovington. As such, education provision should not be viewed as a barrier to allocating additional growth in Bovington.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Bovington Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15136
<b>Person ID</b>	1270940
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	CERDA PLANNING (ON BEHALF OF BOVINGDON PARISH COUNCIL)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Bovington Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Section 23 of the Emerging LP has regard to <i>Delivery Strategies</i> and paras. 23.181 to 23.197 inclusive have specific regard to the strategy for Bovington and notes, at para.23.183, that the proposed level of growth for the village. As noted

previously in these representations, whilst BPC is comfortable with and supports this overall level of development (around 190 new homes) within the village, it regards this number to be a ceiling in the Emerging LP.

In comparison with the two other Large Villages of Kings Langley and Markyate, Bovingdon does not benefit from the same level of access to and frequency of public transport service, nor does it enjoy the same level of ready access to the strategic highway network within the Borough as those other settlements. On balance, therefore, the lack of sustainability that Bovingdon has in comparison to those other settlements, along with concerns over inadequate infrastructure within the village, is a principal factor in BPC's stance that the level of new housing that is proposed in the Emerging LP should be seen as an absolute maximum.

Para.23.183 also acknowledges the constrained nature of some services within the village, including the site of the existing primary school, and that new development will provide new market, affordable and other forms of housing, and will also deliver new infrastructure, including public open space and flood alleviation measures. BPC would be supportive of any development that would alleviate the known issues within the village, provided that the level of development is such that it would not exacerbate issues elsewhere.

Para.23.184 acknowledges that Bovingdon does not currently have a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan. Work on the NP for Bovingdon is progressing, and we can advise that the NP Steering Group is seeking to go out to public consultation on an initial draft in March/April 2021, with a view to formally submitting to the Borough Council in Summer 2021. In terms of suggested housing allocations within the NP, only those two sites that are proposed within the Emerging LP will be proposed when it is submitted.

The diagram of the Key Developments in Bovingdon indicating the two proposed growth areas (housing allocations) at Grange Farm (Site Bv01) and Chesham Road/Molyneux Road (Site Bv02 – a committed site (LA6) from the Site Allocations 2006-2031 document previously adopted by the Council in July 2017) is supported.

Para.23.185 states that at least 240 homes will be provided over the Plan period from 2020-2038 within Bovingdon, including the two aforementioned sites (Bv01 and Bv02), whilst also recognising potential redevelopment opportunities within the settlement boundary on the High Street, and also for previously-developed land outside of the village on the former Bobsleigh Hotel site.

Para.23.186 acknowledges the proposed sustainable urban extension to the village that will see around 150 homes on the Grange Farm site (Bv01), and BPC is comfortable with that level of development within the Emerging LP across the Plan period.

Paras.23.189-23.191 acknowledge that the proposed allocation at Grange Farm can assist in the easing of infrastructure concerns and provide environmental improvements within the village, which BPC welcomes, and notes the past and continuing discussions that have been held with BPC and the Neighbourhood steering group in this regard.

Para.23.197 introduces **Policy SP27: Delivering Growth in Bovingdon** which identifies the Housing Delivery target, the proposed Growth Areas and Renewal Areas for the village. In terms of the Housing Delivery target, the suggested level of development for the Plan period is supported.

With regard to the proposed Growth Areas, the proposed Major Urban Extension of the land at Grange Farm (Bv01), and the proposed level of housing of some 150 homes within that is supported. In addition, the requirement that the proposed allocation would provide an appropriate location for expanded public open space provision for the village, together with safeguarding land for the relocation of the Bovingdon Primary Academy School within the site is also supported.

Indeed, BPC has been involved in continual engagement with the promoters of the Grange Farm site and is aware of their draft proposals for the site to accommodate the level of new homes as suggested by the Emerging LP, both for the provision of general market housing in a range of sizes, types and range of tenures, but also that their proposals will accommodate an area of specialist elderly housing, for which local housing assessments have evidenced a need. In addition, their proposals provide an area which will be safeguarded for the relocation and expansion of the primary school, and will provide public open space and appropriate flood prevention and attenuation areas which will satisfy the specific requirements at pages 329 and 330 of the emerging LP and Neighbourhood Plan.

BPC generally supports the emerging proposals for the proposed Grange Farm allocation, subject to ongoing discussions with the developers regarding the development of the masterplan for the site, which will no doubt be expanded upon by the promoters of the site in question and their Agents in their own submissions to the Emerging LP.

**Included files**

**Title** Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15332

**Person ID** 1271133

**Full Name** Ms Wendy West

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

Following your plans for Bovingdon village, I would really like to object to the amount of houses to be built & also to move the school.

The school is the heart of the village, mothers gather together to use the café & shops.

Green Lane is constantly flooded & the traffic is horrendous there and if you go ahead with your plans for Grange Farm traffic will be 10 times worse.

Please think carefully & listen to the villagers.  
Bovingdon is such a lovely village to live in  
Please do not spoil it

**Included files**

**Title**

Bovingdon Delivery Strategy

**ID**

EGS15383

**Person ID**

1248890

**Full Name**

Mr Stuart Oldroyd

**Organisation Details**

Whiteacre Ltd

**Agent ID**

1270853

**Agent Full Name**

Jon  
Goodall

**Agent Organisation**

DLP Planning Limited

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment**

Page 329 of Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth identifies the draft allocation Bv01 (Grange Farm). Within the site-specific requirements, it states that the site must "connect to existing footpaths, cycleways and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) wherever possible to enhance permeability and connectivity" and "contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Bovingdon High Street including off-site enhancements".

There would appear to be a lack of reference in the plan to the site-specific benefits of permeability at Grange Farm. The site has significant permeability benefits and access to Bovingdon high street, including enhanced pedestrian links to Chesham Road, Pembridge Close and Green Lane which is not overly clear in the recent policy.

The development strategy for Bovingdon is to provide growth broadly in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, recognising its more distant location from high order centres such as Hemel Hempstead, and the constrained nature of some of its services and facilities, including the existing primary school and less frequent public transport services. The focus for development in Bovingdon will be to:

- Provide new market, affordable and other forms of housing.
- Deliver new infrastructure, including new public open space and flood alleviation measures.

Bovingdon has no made Neighbourhood Plan against which to currently allocate and bring forward development, although one is being progressed. This will have an important future role in locally shaping growth in the village, including addressing some of the known issues associated with congestion on the High Street.

The Council has been working in conjunction with the Parish and County Council to explore the feasibility of bringing forward development on Grange Farm, which Whiteacre supports, as it provides the benefits of achieving several outcomes:

- The village centre could gain much needed parking and new community facilities by relocating the school to Grange Farm and away from the High Street;
- The Bovingdon Primary Academy School could be relocated to a greenfield site (linked to the allocation at Grange Farm) to provide a purpose-built and enlarged 3FE school;
- Land would be freed up in the High Street for housing or other uses;
- Improvements would be secured to the quality of the urban environment/public realm in the village centre; and
- The scheme could deliver an enhanced green space and play area for the village.

Page 329 of Dacorum’s Emerging Strategy for Growth identifies the draft allocation Bv01 (Grange Farm). Within the site-specific requirements, it states that the site must “*connect to existing footpaths, cycleways and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) wherever possible to enhance permeability and connectivity*” and “*contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Bovingdon High Street including off- site enhancements*”.

Whiteacre maintains that there would appear to be a lack of reference in the plan to the site-specific benefits of non-car permeability at Grange Farm. The site has significant permeability benefits and access to Bovingdon high street, including enhanced pedestrian and cycle links to Chesham Road and Green Lane which are not overly clear in the recent policy.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15593
<b>Person ID</b>	1271610
<b>Full Name</b>	MR SIMON MILLIKEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* <b>Yes</b>	
* <b>No</b>	



<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>EH Smith is of the view that the Bovingdon Brickworks employment 'Growth Area' proposals (Cy02), which are currently listed under 'Countryside Proposals and Sites', should instead be more accurately included within the 'Bovingdon Delivery Strategy' part of the plan and likewise, within the 'Bovingdon Proposals and Sites' .</p> <p>EH Smith would propose that Policy SP27 - 'Delivering Growth in Bovingdon' is AMENDED to include the Bovingdon Brickworks site as a 'Growth Area' for 8,000m2 of employment development for office, light industrial, general industrial and storage &amp; warehousing uses (plus those uses which are deemed to be acceptable within a General Employment Area under Policy DM 16) . In addition, the 'Key Development in Bovingdon' map should be AMENDED to show the 'Bovingdon Brickworks' site. This would then serve to cross-correlate with the emergent Bovingdon Neighbourhood Plan - as proposed by E H Smith.</p> <p>EH Smith would propose this approach given that there are strong historical links between Bovingdon village and the brickworks site in which a large part of the former brickwork's workforce came from the Bovingdon Village. Clearly, there is a high degree of connectivity between the proposed Bovingdon brickwork's employment 'Growth Area' and the proposed extension of Bovingdon village for 240 dwellings in sustainable development terms. The listing of Bovingdon brickworks employment 'Growth Area' under the 'Countryside Proposals and Sites' does not properly take account of this important connection .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bovingdon Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS15711
<b>Person ID</b>	1273151
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Megan Green
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Senior Planner Thakeham Homes Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Bovingdon Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Sites are proposed in Bovingdon for at least 240 homes in the draft Local Plan (comprising existing commitments, windfalls, 40 homes on the site adjacent to Chesham Road/Molyneaux Ave and 150 homes and land for a primary school

at Grange Farm, Green Lane). Within these next sections, Thakeham details its concerns with the Council's approach to growth in Bovingdon and highlights issues with the deliverability of both of these draft site allocations. The site at Fox Meadow offers significantly greater community benefits than the current strategy (the allocation of the two afore-mentioned sites) within the Plan period.

Under the "The Vision for Dacorum's Places" on page 24 of the draft Local Plan, it states that Bovingdon will "*have provided increased levels of affordable homes; have strengthened their role in providing services and facilities to serve residents and the adjacent rural communities; and have secured additional and improved local community facilities*". Apart from the land reserved for a school site no other community facilities are proposed for Bovingdon as part of the draft site allocations. Indeed, in relation to the school site, it is merely a reservation of land and there is no commitment to the delivery of a completed school, nor is there any indication

as to when and how the funds for such a school would become available. Therefore, as currently presented, the draft Local Plan does not meet the Council's own vision for the Bovingdon.

The Bovingdon Delivery Strategy set out in the draft Local Plan states that growth should be broadly in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. Nevertheless, the Council's Topic Paper on Development Strategy (November 2020) states that Bovingdon represents 3.5% of the total housing stock in the Borough yet has seen just 35 new homes completed in the period 2006- 2019 (Table 3.1). This shortfall in delivery to date will be made worse by the draft Local Plan which proposes just 240 homes over an 18 year period (the equivalent of 13 new homes per annum). This equates to just 1.4% of the housing numbers in the draft Local Plan, tantamount to a decline in Bovingdon's contribution to the overall housing stock. By applying 3.5% to the 16,899 figure, a more appropriate level of growth for Bovingdon would be 590 new homes during the Plan period. This would ensure Bovingdon consistently contributes towards the overall housing stock in the Borough.

The Bovingdon Delivery Strategy also refers to the existing primary school being constrained. Research carried out on behalf of Thakeham and other interested parties concludes;

*"There is one Primary School serving Bovingdon (Bovingdon Primary Academy). This is a 2FE school with minor surplus capacity at present. However, the school draws from a wide geographical area, including home locations that are closer*

*to other schools. Additionally, there are two schools within the Ward (Bovingdon Primary Academy, and St Paul's, Chipperfield), with more places available than there are births annually. Birth numbers are falling in the Ward, with 2018 and 2019 seeing some of the lowest numbers in the past two decades. When applying local data to the EFM trajectory model, the indication is by the academic year 2023/24, there should be sufficient places within the Ward to accommodate the Primary pupil demand from over 600 new dwellings.” – EFM ‘Education Report Bovingdon, Hertfordshire’ July 2020. (this report has already been provided to DBC, but can be made available on request)*

Therefore, it is evident that primary school provision is not a justification for artificially capping the growth of the village and so Thakeham would suggest the approach to housing numbers in Bovingdon be revisited.

**Included files**

# 23 Markyate Delivery Strategy responses

<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS65
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS385
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260042
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Mitchell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS481
<b>Person ID</b>	1258240
<b>Full Name</b>	Adele Giles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS643
<b>Person ID</b>	1261183
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Fairfull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

## Markyate Delivery Strategy comment

Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.

My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.

The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.

Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity?

You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan.

It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.

Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.

These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.

In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town

by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS649

**Person ID** 1261205

**Full Name** Stephen Lovelock

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Markyate Delivery Strategy comment**

I refer to the proposal to build 150 new homes on the greenfield site at the southern end of London Road, Markyate (23.204). This site is at present a field used to pasture cattle with no vehicular access. It is directly opposite the junction of London Road and the A5183. This junction is at present a bottleneck during peak times with traffic often backing up London Road waiting for an opportunity to turn right onto the A5183. Your records should show the number of accidents at this site in recent years (some fatal), largely caused by motorists waiting for a gap in the traffic to arise and then misjudging the speed of oncoming vehicles. The A5183 is often affected by the traffic flow on the M1. If 150 new homes are to be built at this location (presumably with a minimum of 1 car per household) it will considerably increase the volume of traffic trying to exit the village. What consideration is being given to the access and egress to the new development and especially to assist traffic flow from London Road onto the A5183? Is any provision being made for an increased population in the village such as pressure on the doctors surgery and primary school?

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS661

**Person ID** 1261122

**Full Name** Mark Slade

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1290
<b>Person ID</b>	1259116
<b>Full Name</b>	Tring in Transition (TinT)
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1644
<b>Person ID</b>	1262323
<b>Full Name</b>	Emma Hilder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The number of houses planned here are too many. Plus it's a flood area which means the water will have to be either directed back to the houses in the village or onto the roads
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1930
<b>Person ID</b>	1262553
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Wallis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2144
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2166
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2431
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2619
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3457
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3747
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3992
<b>Person ID</b>	1261840
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4021
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4341
<b>Person ID</b>	1264326
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Sinclair-Day
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.204. 150 homes proposed. This does little to consider the flood risk issues given climate change. Building on a greenfield site is NOT a sustainable option.</p> <p>23.205. This not a sustainable development or option. It is placing more reliance on motor vehicles entering the village and surrounding areas. No green solution has been proposed i.e. increase electric buses to the village. Unlikely improvements to London Road and High Street will materialise. a) The Council is only interested in meeting its housing quota and whilst it "might explore other opportunities", these will not be implemented. The failure to do so at the Hicks Road development to secure a car management plan with the developer is a case in point , b) be feasible given the width of the roads and reliance on motor cars.</p> <p>The roads in Markyate cannot take anymore on road car parking.</p> <p>Air pollution is another impact on the village.</p> <p>23.207. The new development on the former employment area on Hicks Road DID NOT DELIVER extra parking for the village centre and the extension of the doctor's surgery has reduced the car parking provision in the car park by transferring spaces to that facility. The Council need to be coherent to the sustainability issues in the country and globally and reduce cars into the village.</p> <p>SP28. Table 47 Mk02. c13 dwelling houses on Hicks Road is another example of not listening to residents' opinions. Hicks Road is already over capacity, the air, noise and light pollution created by the 79 dwellings has made a big negative impact on the quality of the environment in this area. Further traffic access/egress will make this bad situation worse.</p> <p>I object to any new housing developments in the village. This once quiet, historic village is gradually being eroded and will soon be a small town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4540
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5169
<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5303
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5503
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5542
<b>Person ID</b>	1264048
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Fraser
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	



* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5564
<b>Person ID</b>	1264491
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5692
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5774
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5907
<b>Person ID</b>	1264752
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6267
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6414
<b>Person ID</b>	1264750
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6628
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6818
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7034
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7083
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7645
<b>Person ID</b>	1151288
<b>Full Name</b>	MS KATHRYN PACKHAM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Markyate and have, on and off, lived here all my life my late father was even born here. We have seen many changes happen to the village over the years, some very good things and some not so good things, but the overriding feeling is that Markyate is a lovely village to live in and raise a family.</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the current application to build upon the greenbelt land in the area, I appreciate that we need housing and we need AFFORDABLE housing but the scale which is being proposed is both mind boggling and ill thought out.</p> <p>Currently the cottage that we used to live in at the far end of London road is under considerable water in the gardens along with the rest of the stretch of houses, building on flood plain is always a bit risky and thankfully flooding doesn't happen that often, but the green land and trees around helps to absorb this water, but my concern would be adding thousands of extra houses would take away natures ability to drain due to the extra concrete and hard surfaces and therefore flooding would be a much more regular occurrence.</p> <p>Also the added number of residents will add a huge strain to the local school which is already at capacity and may mean having to drive to a nearby school which will probably be having the same concerns as Markyate and wondering how on earth they can accommodate all local children let alone those from neighbouring areas.</p>

The pandemic that we are in at the moment has shone a light on the fact that outdoor green space is a lifeline to everyone's mental and physical well-being.

I urge you to reconsider the volume of houses being proposed before it is too late and we are turned into yet another faceless development, with poor infrastructure and gridlocked roads.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS7785

**Person ID** 1265901

**Full Name** Noelle Hudson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Markyate Delivery Strategy comment** I object strongly to more houses being built in the already overstretched village of Markyate. Markyate already struggles under its current limited infrastructure - (traffic/parking/road use/doctors/shops/school places). Markyate is a very old, historical village set amongst farmland and countryside and it has already been over developed as it is. This plan does little to address the improvements on infrastructure that will be needed to support the new houses.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8360

**Person ID** 1265009

**Full Name** Sue and Paul Dupree

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Marykate school has already been extended and the approach to the school is very congested in the area and I believe a voluntary one-way system in in place during the school drop off and pick up times and of course the resident parking problem more houses will create. The last lot of houses that were built did not have enough parking places and one of the suggestions was that the residents would be using bikes to travel around the area. Also, because they were social houses being built parking spaces were not allocated and it was felt that the people who live in these houses would not be able to afford cars!! Planners do not live in the real world.</p> <p>There is also the matter of the of the extra water needed for the area and the this will be damaging to the natural chalk rivers in the area.</p> <p>The River Ver which runs through the village causes problems to local residents due to flooding and houses being built on the flood plains south of the village back in the 60's and 70s'.</p> <p>This year fields have been under water for most of the winter south of the village, this area must not be built on. Having the River running under the village in culverts is not practical and does not help the local wild life and natural beauty of the area either.</p> <p>Transport to local towns is a joke as it is not there for the needs of employment to the area. We have busses that go to St Albans to Dunstable and Hemel to Luton. Limited time table in operation. Nothing to Harpenden / train station, Watford / Hospital or the other outlying villages around in the area. A car is a necessary item to live in the village. There needs to be more jobs created for the area for the increased housing to the area.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8651
<b>Person ID</b>	1266621
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Le-May
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am emailing in response to the proposed local plan.</p> <p>I am a Markyate resident and have lived on (address removed) with my family since 2007.</p> <p>Over the years Markyate has seen 2 major developments, one at Hicks Rd and one at the North End of the High St.</p> <p>The Hicks Rd development in particular has not delivered on what was promised. Namely, no new doctors surgery, no decent social area, no filled retail units and the road frequently floods. Large parts of the area remain unfinished to this day.</p> <p>Markyate simply cannot support anymore large developments. We have campaigned for the last ten years for a 20MPH speed limit which we finally achieved with support from Terry Douris.</p> <p>Parking is difficult, roads are often impassable with buses and cars mounting the pavements on a frequent basis. Adding more through traffic would only make the situation worse.</p> <p>Markyate is a village with many grade II listed properties and a history which should be maintained.</p> <p>It cannot support large new developments (not enough amenities, and the empty retail units are too expensive for anyone to fill them). And new developments should certainly not be planned for green belt land.</p> <p>Please accept this email as my objection to the massive proposed expansion to the village.</p> <p>Main reasons:</p> <p>Erosion of green belt land</p> <p>Previous developments not delivering on promises so no faith in any future developments going to plan Lack of infrastructure to support so many new homes Lack of parking Roads are too narrow and unsafe already Not in keeping with the local area</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8711
<b>Person ID</b>	1231045

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs & Mr Dixey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to Dacorum's Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth.</p> <p>I do not agree to any more homes being built in Markyate.</p> <p>The current pandemic has shown how important our local green spaces are and that our green belt land must be protected. I do not believe that inflated housing need is an exceptional circumstance for removing Dacorum's green belt.</p> <p>Green belt land helps protect the shape, size and character of towns and villages preventing them merging into one another.</p> <p>This plan underestimates the potential for brownfield regeneration opportunities which have increased due to the pandemic with more people working from home.</p> <p>The plan does little to address the improvements on infrastructure that will be needed to support new houses. We currently have no hospital, functioning police station or sufficient schools &amp; residents parking.</p> <p>I understand that we don't have enough water to supply all the extra houses. I believe from what I have read that the extra water needed can only be extracted from the chalk aquifer which in turn will damage the borough's chalk rivers which are classified as priority habitats by the Natural Environment &amp; Rural Communities Act 2006.</p> <p>The plan would also be taking away much valued local businesses, which add to the quality of life of residents. Building homes on the Hicks Road and by Shaws will make road traffic accidents even more of a risk than they already are; coming out on to A5 is hazardous and more traffic would greatly add to the risk of more accidents. And the Hicks Road and High Street Corner is extremely dangerous; we have children walking to school and despite a 20mph speed limit this is not adhered to. Traffic going through village up to Beechwood School also adds to the danger.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8732
<b>Person ID</b>	1266749
<b>Full Name</b>	FRANCES BUSH

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to Dacorum's Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth. There are far too many houses proposed for Markyate. The proposed increase in houses and population will effectively mean that our medieval village is turned into a Town but without the requisite infrastructure.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8770
<b>Person ID</b>	1266773
<b>Full Name</b>	D GOODWIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I would like to make the following comments in relation to the village of Markyate and the proposed Housing development.  Apart from the loss of "Green belt" and subsequent damage to the environment the existing infrastructure would not support the increase in population in terms of education, health provision, and essential food and retail outlets, and would also detrimentally encourage enhanced traffic congestion and parking issues.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9104
<b>Person ID</b>	1267076
<b>Full Name</b>	SELMA HAKKI
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>It has been brought to our attention that Markyate village is marked for expansion of new homes.</p> <p>I have lived here all of my life &amp; have seen the village grow, which up until now was to be expected &amp; welcome. However, the village is now becoming far too over developed, building homes is much much more than having available land to develop, it is the amenities &amp; infrastructure. It has become a death trap on trying to exit the village with queuing traffic blocking all entrances &amp; exits on to the A5 in busy periods, our high street frequently impassable due to parked cars &amp; traffic, &amp; even now, with our new improved GP surgery underway will be under more pressure, we struggle &amp; have to wait for appointments now, with many more people it will be horrendous.</p> <p>Markyate is a small historic village &amp; has already been overdeveloped, it simply cannot withstand any more traffic... the small roads will not withstand any further development &amp; would be detrimental to the current population.</p> <p>It is literally at bursting point at times, there is no parking for existing residents, &amp; what there is is inadequate... it is plain &amp; simple, the village of Markyate &amp; it's roads, high St, &amp; parking is completely unable to cope with any more increase in the population.</p> <p>The village is not cared for by Dacorum now... with poorly kept hedgerows all overgrown, green areas &amp; grass cut far too infrequent &amp; the trees of the village in residential street... such as Parkfield far too big &amp; near foundations of homes, which despite efforts of residents Highways refuse to rectify...if we are being neglected now...how will new developments in the future be maintained.</p> <p>Grass verges are mud baths &amp; being torn up by vehicles parking on them &amp; driving along to squeeze pass oncoming traffic &amp; parked cars making the roads impassible.</p> <p>It is ludicrous to consider any further expansion until the current issues are addressed &amp; rectified &amp; the village is prepared fir any further expansion!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy

<b>ID</b>	EGS9812
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Children's Services</u>. Development proposed within Markyate during the plan period amounts to an increase of 183 dwellings on three separate allocations. This amounts to an additional child yield of 4fe when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield. When taking this into account, along with further developments arising from windfall and existing commitments, the expansion of Markyate Primary School and Katherine Warrington Secondary School in Harpenden, should be sufficient to in order to meet the pupil yield arising from developments within the town.</p> <p><u>Transport</u>. Increasing walking access throughout the village (and walking/ cycling access to local employment areas) should be an ambition, and with the level of development that is envisaged, a high-quality change to the village could be achieved.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9984
<b>Person ID</b>	1267847
<b>Full Name</b>	CRAIG & ANNA SCARBOROUGH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>An issue very high on my priority list is the residents on Long Meadow, Markyate, have a serious issue with the main drains/sewage pipes. These are currently very full/at risk of overflowing on some properties and others have their drains half full. There is clearly a problem somewhere in the system and is at serious risk of sewage overflow into residential properties, housing elderly people and families with children. The drainage system is 'overloaded' as quoted by the contractor (Lanes) who came to inspect last week to check and has escalated the issue higher; however still no further forward as to how they are to resolve this serious and hazardous risk.</p> <p>There is a planning proposal currently being consulted for a residential care home being built on the Marvin's Magic factory which I don't object to. However I and my neighbours have grave concerns about the drainage infrastructure if we are already experiencing problems even without a further 73 bedroomed property being built and sharing the same drainage system, which is wholly inadequate.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10180
<b>Person ID</b>	1268082
<b>Full Name</b>	Novanne Clark
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>As a resident in Markyate I would like to implore the future development to be shelved.</p> <p>It would ruin the feel of our village and community to put more housing here. It is a beautiful village that has beautiful countryside that would be lost if this development goes ahead. Haven't we lost enough green spaces already ?</p> <p>Please, please, reconsider building more housing, it would not enhance the village but would mar the beauty if its beauty and community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10414
<b>Person ID</b>	1268435
<b>Full Name</b>	DANIEL HUMPHRIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I am emailing in response to the “New Dacorum Local Plan (2020 - 2038) Emerging Strategy For Growth”.</p> <p>I am a resident of Markyate and along with all the residents love our VILLAGE. We love the fact we are living in beautiful green belt land. A historic village with an amazing old high street and surrounded by fields.</p> <p>Having done some research I am of the belief that both Dacorum and the governments targets are very outdated in terms of housing targets. The world has moved on even in the past couple of years let alone the past 6 since they were set. Our village doesn't need more people. It doesn't need more houses. It doesn't need the green belt land destroyed. Allowing this is setting a president for developers to build anywhere.</p> <p>We are in a dire position as a country and as a planet when it comes to global warming. Getting rid of this land does not help this.</p> <p>From where I can see the developments being placed off hicks road, you would be removing valuable business services to the community too. How does this make any sense?</p> <p>I grew up in Higham Ferrers in Northamptonshire and watched the towns of Higham and Rushden destroyed by over development. Higham was a lovely small town very similar to Markyate. And is now surrounded by ugly new builds with too many residents.</p>

I truly hope that Dacorum reconsider the unnecessary overdevelopment of its villages. To try and reach an unnecessary target. There should be, particularly after the year we've had, a complete rethink on these figures.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10544

**Person ID** 1268671

**Full Name** Mr Mike Jennings

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Markyate Delivery Strategy comment**

The delivery strategies are inappropriate because the premise of the housing need / development growth is not sustainable and lacks justification because the council has over estimated the requirement for growth, exceeding the Governments requirements. Dacorum is a Borough with a large area identified as of environmental importance. The present demands on the environment are causing a deterioration in the environment. Hence the proposed growth will further damage the environment, especially around Tring and Berkhamsted. Mitigation measures are required that will result in Net Environmental Gain NEG (as identified in the NPPF). A high quality environment surrounds these towns, albeit deteriorating due to current recreational pressures. Sufficient measures to provide NEG are not feasible within the local environment. Offsetting the impacts elsewhere will not compensate for the impacts on the local environment. This will inevitably lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the SAC, SSSI's and local areas of importance to biodiversity.

These adverse impacts do not comply with the local policies and national legislation.

Delivery strategies in the plan need to take into account the latest information with respect to carbon, nitrogen and nutrient neutrality issues (In Practice December 2020, Page 6 Nutrient neutrality; Air pollution Pages 7-10; Nitrogen pollution Pages 11 - 14). The reference provided has other articles that are also relevant in the context of all local plans.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12024



<b>Person ID</b>	1161359
<b>Full Name</b>	D B Land and Planning
<b>Organisation Details</b>	D B Land and Planning
<b>Agent ID</b>	1161362
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Nathan McLoughlin
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	McLoughlin Planning
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Markyate Delivery Strategy</p> <p>DBLP support the Local Plan's approach to new housing development at Markyate and in particular the requirements of Policy SP28 setting out the overarching priority of providing at least 215 dwellings through the Plan period. The allocation MK01, which requires around 150 dwellings to be provided will make a critical contribution to the overarching priority in the policy.</p> <p>In terms of Green Belt release, DBLP wish to make the point that for this site to be developed it has to be removed from the Green Belt. It requires exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated as per paragraph 137 of the Framework. In addition to this, paragraph 136 requires all other reasonable options are examined before opting for Green Belt release. In terms of what comprises exceptional circumstances, Case Law has demonstrated it does not have to be limited to one circumstance but merely linked to several combined factors, which demonstrate that it's set of exceptional circumstances exist. In this instance, it can be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to review the Plan.</li> <li>• The housing requirement over the Plan period as required by the Standard Method.</li> <li>• Non-green belt opportunities which may be available.</li> </ul> <p>Given the projected housing requirement, physical and other planning constraints in Dacorum Borough, it is possible to conclude that exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. This is because Dacorum Borough is simply unable to meet its housing requirements without reverting to greenfield and Green Belt development. It is more a question of which land will be released for development.</p> <p>In response to previous consultations, it is considered that the evidence base supporting the Plan is sufficiently robust to justify the release of Green Belt land at Markyate. In releasing this land and being equally conscious of the requirements of the Framework at paragraph 77 and 78 regarding rural housing supporting local services and facilities, the release of land at London Road represents an ideal opportunity in Framework terms to deliver rural housing in a constrained environment. In addition, whilst the site is within the Green Belt, it is not subject to any other environmental designation</p>

that would automatically prohibit its development or put in place additional policy tests over and above what would otherwise be required in Green Belt terms.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12889

**Person ID** 1269665

**Full Name** Mr Martin Hicks

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Markyate Delivery Strategy comment** Development in Markyate does not recognise the ecological potential of the upper reaches of the Ver Valley which will be directly affected. In this respect the plan is not sustainable. 23.204 should acknowledge this issue.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS12904

**Person ID** 1207443

**Full Name** Mrs Jennifer Bissmire

**Organisation Details** Clerk  
Markyate Parish Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Markyate Delivery  
Strategy comment**

Delivery Strategies

Markyate Delivery Strategies Ref 23.199

Ref 23.200

Markyate Parish Council refer to the joint request from Town and Parish Councils that Dacorum Borough Council withdraw their Local Plan as it should not include development in the Green Belt, In addition, the Parish Council agrees that there has been a considerable expansion in the village under the previous Plan and the village cannot cope with more congestion or on-street parking. They will comment further on the viability of local services under Question 5 when the details of the proposed sites can be seen.

Key Developments in Markyate

The map under this heading is useless in defining the proposed development areas, further all roads save the A5183 are shown as 'trunk roads'. The road to Slip End is B4540, while the continuation of this route to Gaddesdan Row (and Hemel Hempstead) is unclassified. Likewise the road to Whipnade, but these are at least wide enough for vehicles to pass each other. The road to Kinsbourne Green is a single track road with a ford.

The Parish Council are disappointed that this map should be considered informative.

Ref 23.204

This site is Green Belt land and should not be developed. The extra issue of flood risk is inadequately described as the site also suffers from run-off from the fields further up the slope, is a reason on it's own for not developing the site.

Ref 23.206

Markyate Parish Council dispute the assessment of our local employment. The employment area was contracted when developers made the proposal for the new housing and other facilities in Hicks Road. Markyate lost several employers to other areas and some small businesses were forced to close. As pointed out under Question 3, Markyate has a long-established skilled engineering workforce with small businesses meeting specialised needs of Luton based Companies such as Vauxhall and suppliers to Luton Airport. Dacorum policy makers have consistently failed to acknowledge this.

Ref 23.207

The Parish Council agree that the local shopping and service role needs to be maintained, but the redevelopment in Hicks Road has not provided extra parking, on the contrary the inadequate parking provision for the new housing helped create the current situation, as acknowledged in ref 23.199.

Ref 23.208

While disputing development, the Parish Council does support this junction improvement, which will help ease some of the congestion in the High Street.

Further comments on sites Mk01, Mk02 and Mk03 are given in Question 5 comments as the policies relating to this question include the details of the sites.

The following quote from the Local Plan follows as it is the only reference to Mk04. It is highlighted in grey

1 Renewal Areas

Mk04 Markyate High Street –

The following renewal areas are important to the delivery strategy for Markyate. Proposals for new development in these locations will be supported where they accord with relevant local and national policies.

Table 48

The Council will bring forward Design Codes for the Growth Areas. These will be prepared jointly by the Council and by Parcel Developers, with community engagement and will need to be in accordance with the Plan and supporting guidance as a whole.

Markyate Parish Council is very concerned that possible backfilling off the High Street will add to congestion and create dangerous, blind entrances between High Street properties. Such developments should be considered as a whole, not with individual developers.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12909
<b>Person ID</b>	1207443
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jennifer Bissmire
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Clerk Markyate Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Markyate Parish Council in the joint representation from the Town & Parish Councils to Cllr Williams, leader of Dacorum Borough Council said  'The Plan does not meet the needs of our communities and its ambitions will undermine the quality of life of our residents whether they live in towns, villages or rural areas. We ask that the Borough Council withdraws this Plan as it needs to be fundamentally re-shaped to reflect the Vision of the community to retain the Green Belt and the Borough's objectively assessed housing needs.' Although there are many other reasons to oppose the proposed housing developments in Markyate, the fundamental opposition is to building in the Green Belt (Mk01) The other two sites within the village (Mk02

and Mk03) cannot be supported as they are valued employment sites. It may seem ambitious to seek to have no further development in Markyate, but it has been acknowledged in the Dacorum Local Plan ref 23.199 that Markyate has seen relatively high levels of development and that village centre suffers from congestion and on-street parking problems.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13847

**Person ID** 1270387

**Full Name** Mr Richard Pilkinton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Markyate Delivery Strategy comment**

I will not try to comment on employment or retailing under this question as the information given is inadequate. The maps do not define the areas proposed for development in Markyate or anywhere else.

However, I am concerned that the Dacorum Local Plan discounts the problems of building on a water meadow of the River Ver. This problem is highlighted throughout the documents and should not be part of the guiding policies, the development should be dropped.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS13850

**Person ID** 1270387

**Full Name** Mr Richard Pilkinton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Markyate had considerable new housing built under the previous local plan. The village cannot cope with more congestion or on-street parking.</p> <p>Details of the proposed sites cannot be seen on the map which relates to the information for this question so I will comment under question 5.</p> <p>Key Developments in Markyate</p> <p>The map under this heading is useless in defining the proposed development areas, further all roads save the A5183 are shown as 'trunk roads'. The road to Slip End is B4540, other roads, while unclassified, are at least wide enough for vehicles to pass each other with the exception of the road to Kinsbourne Green which is a single track road with a ford. I hope this map does not represent the planners understanding of our village.</p> <p>The site off London Road - Ref 23.204 is Green Belt land and should not be developed. The extra issue of flood risk is inadequately described as the site also suffers from run-off from the fields further up the slope, is a reason on it's own for not developing the site.</p> <p>The local shopping and services role needs to be maintained. The redevelopment in Hicks Road has not provided extra parking, on the contrary the inadequate parking provision for the new housing helped create the current situation.</p> <p>The improvement of the London Road / Bypass A5183 junction at the South of the village which will help ease some of the congestion in the High Street.</p> <p>Comments on sites Mk01, Mk02 and Mk03 are given in Question 5 comments as the details of the sites are only given with pages relating to this question.</p> <p>I find the site Mk04 worrying. It is only mentioned in relation to this question. It would appear that these sites relate to possible backfilling off the High Street. This will add to congestion and create dangerous, blind entrances between High Street properties. The cumulative impact of such backfilling needs to be considered as a whole. I do not think the High Street can cope now, so adding any more feeds from new developments will cause more traffic problems. Certainly such developments should not be considered on an individual basis with a developer looking for financial gains not to the wellbeing of our community.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13862
<b>Person ID</b>	611689
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sheila Pilkinton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Markyate Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I will not try to comment on employment or retailing under this question as the information given is inadequate. The maps do not define the areas proposed for development in Markyate or anywhere else.</p> <p>However, I am concerned that the Dacorum Local Plan discounts the problems of building on a water meadow of the River Ver. This problem is highlighted throughout the documents and should not be part of the guiding policies, the development should be dropped.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Markyate Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13865
<b>Person ID</b>	611689
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sheila Pilkinton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Markyate Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Markyate Delivery Strategy comment**

Markyate had considerable new housing built under the previous local plan. The village cannot cope with more congestion or on-street parking.

Details of the proposed sites cannot be seen on the map which relates to the information for this question so I will comment under question 5.

**Key Developments in Markyate**

The map under this heading is useless in defining the proposed development areas, further all roads save the A5183 are shown as 'trunk roads'. The road to Slip End is B4540, other roads, while unclassified, are at least wide enough for vehicles to pass each other with the exception of the road to Kinsbourne Green which is a single track road with a ford.

I hope this map does not represent the planners understanding of our village.

The site off London Road - Ref 23.204 is Green Belt land and should not be developed. The extra issue of flood risk is inadequately described as the site also suffers from run-off from the fields further up the slope, is a reason on it's own for not developing the site.

The local shopping and services role needs to be maintained. The redevelopment in Hicks Road has not provided extra parking, on the contrary the inadequate parking provision for the new housing helped create the current situation.

The improvement of the London Road / Bypass A5183 junction at the South of the village which will help ease some of the congestion in the High Street.

Comments on sites Mk01, Mk02 and Mk03 are given in Question 5 comments as the details of the sites are only given with pages relating to this question.

I find the site Mk04 worrying. It is only mentioned in relation to this question. It would appear that these sites relate to possible backfilling off the High Street. This will add to congestion and create dangerous, blind entrances between High Street properties. The cumulative impact of such backfilling needs to be considered as a whole. I do not think the High Street can cope now, so adding any more feeds from new developments will cause more traffic problems. Certainly such developments should not be considered on an individual basis with a developer looking for financial gains not to the wellbeing of our community.

**Included files**

**Title** Markyate Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14980

**Person ID** 1207224



<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Markyate Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Kings Langley and Markyate are both settlements that are set along main rivers. We would like to be consulted on any masterplans/strategies for these areas.
<b>Included files</b>	

# 23 Countryside Delivery Strategy responses

<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS54
<b>Person ID</b>	1254476
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Moriarty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	As close neighbours we wish to object strongly to the proposal to develop 60 homes on the Lock Field site on New Road, Berkhamsted Bk07. The road is already dangerous given the narrow paths. The development will add to traffic levels and destroy the character of the road and views from it.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS66
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>23.226</b> Expanding the existing Watling Street Truckstop on the A5183 to provide additional lorry parking to meet local and wider demand and improved on-site facilities will help address Highways England's wider ambition to increase provision for lorry parking on the strategic road network. It will provide improved rest facilities in support of highway safety and dedicated parking to reduce unauthorised parking and associated public nuisance.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS148
<b>Person ID</b>	1256692
<b>Full Name</b>	Cliff Slynn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS360
<b>Person ID</b>	1259924
<b>Full Name</b>	Bassil Aslam
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	1259009
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bassil Aslam
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Support is given to Policy SP29, Table 50 ie. the need for some 241 new homes to be delivered via Windfall sites, with reference to the two proposed Housing sites put forward for consideration by the Council in Flamstead ie. 1) Land lying to the West of Chequers Hill, and 2) Land East of Chequers Hill. These tow sites could come forward in a 'Windfall' way.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS386
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260042
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Mitchell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The extensive use of the Greenbelt for development between Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead goes against the purposes of the Greenbelt as described in the NPPF. Specifically, the Hemel Garden Communities project will see urban sprawl into the Greenbelt and the narrowing of the gap between Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead. In addition, the extensive use of the Greenbelt will damage the local environment and ecology adding to the problems of climate change. On these issues, Redbourn Parish Council objects to the draft Dacorum Local Plan.

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS482
<b>Person ID</b>	1258240
<b>Full Name</b>	Adele Giles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS644
<b>Person ID</b>	1261183
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Fairfull
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	No

\* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

Growth at any cost is not the answer. The "vision" mentions sustainability throughout, but none of this growth is sustainable. Overloading areas with a population it cannot support will be detrimental to the countryside, farm land, green space and the lives of those who have chosen to live in the area. Steady and monitored growth means strategic thinking and adapting to changing conditions. Build the infrastructure and only then, grow in line with that. The policy as it stands is to build at a rapid rate, seemingly at any cost.

My experiences are of living in Tring, but it is likely the sentiment is echoed all through the Borough. For example, it is already hard to get a doctors/dentist appointment. Increase healthcare capacity, then grow the community.

The employment growth you are forecasting is simply a proposal and not a reality. We simply can't know what the economic situation will be – some of your plan may succeed, but others will likely falter. Build the economy, then build the housing.

Tring is a commuter town and a (significant) proportion of new inhabitants will likely commute to London on a trainline already at capacity. Station car parks are full before rush hour is over - where is the proposal to increase that capacity?

You mention building a better link between Tring and the station, build it first and demonstrate that it works. What is currently in place is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. A small cohort will cycle in any weather, many (including me!) will not and will resort to driving. You also can't change the existing road infrastructure; Tring high street is extremely narrow. A single vehicle stopping (eg deliveries, mail van) backs up traffic. Increasing housing in Tring by such radical numbers will result in far more congestion and pollution – flying directly in the face of your environment plan.

It's easy to demonstrate now that people drive to the town and do not walk, and an increase in population will result in increased traffic, particularly as the green belt sites are some distance from the town centre.

Residents in this area should not be made to pay for short sighted thinking. The proposal to build vast numbers does one thing; makes developers very rich. They will build the standard "cookie cutter" houses, with minimal space between properties, minimal parking and a minimal green space. Once they have been paid, they will leave and having irreparably changed the face of the town, we, and future generations will be left to suffer the consequences.

These new estates seen all over the country are the modern equivalent of tower blocks build in the 60s. We will look back in 50 years and wonder why anyone thought they were a good idea. The example to the west of Tring is a key demonstration of this. Decorating the house that face the main road with a pretty stone façade is just that, a façade. Look within the roads and you see narrow houses, squashed in at the edge of town, forcing people to drive to town. Maximising profits for developers, ignoring the real needs of the town inhabitants.

In the original "vision", I believe the proposed number of houses in Tring was between 600 and 1100, which seemed absurdly high. You have now raised this to 2,731 (an odd number, how can you be so exact? Presumably because this was calculated by a formula rather than rationale thought) but cannot see any justification for that alarming increase. I made the same points then, grow the infrastructure and then grow the housing stock, not the other way around. Targets are not the answer. Destroying green belt and farm land is not the answer. Once you have made these mistakes, we cannot go back.

This may be mandated from Westminster, but your job as our local representatives is to fight back. I am not anti-growth – our population is expanding, but we need to grow in a sustainable, controlled way, not mandating the growth of a town by 40-50%. I spent many hours reading through the 2017 documents and responding. Now to find out that you are “doubling down” on expansion at such a rate is very disheartening. Many people do not have the time to read through such lengthy document and reply but their lack of response should not be taken as de facto approval. We love where we live. Please, take the time to make the right choice and not put this monstrosity of a plan into action.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS662

**Person ID** 1261122

**Full Name** Mark Slade

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS760

**Person ID** 1261250

**Full Name** Christina Thompson

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS895
<b>Person ID</b>	1261484
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Wraight
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>"23.211 The Plan identifies the bulk of the countryside as a Protected Area in recognition of its high environmental qualities and where a more stringent approach to managing development will apply."</p> <p>In the last year, the increased number of people visiting the Ashridge Estate and other local spots is putting a real strain on the parking and footpaths. Adding more houses will add more strain to those areas. More grass verges will be damaged, more pathways churned up by increased footfall. What "stringent approach" will this project use to ensure that our beautiful countryside does not sustain firther damage?</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1188
<b>Person ID</b>	1258939
<b>Full Name</b>	Ed Shedd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.213 We fully agree with this statement "the traditional role of the countryside is likely to change over the lifetime of the Plan with a growing emphasis on climate change adaptation / environmental measures / landscape management, <b>much of which sits outside the scope and control of the planning system</b>".</p> <p>Having read the Dacorum Local Plan, the majority, perhaps 95%+? of the document focusses on those areas being developed. Quite understandably, as we need to know what mitigating actions will be taken to balance the social, economic and environmental priorities which guide decision making.</p> <p>However, as with many of the large scale agricultural fields to be found in the CAOB e.g. farms above Nettleden, in St Margarets and down to the Leighton Buzzard Road, the silence is deafening. Why is there not a similar focus on the areas not being developed, with attendant measures in place to mitigate climate change, increase biodiversity and to ensure that the polluter pays within the countryside. It is this silence which we found truly frightening. Whilst we may not agree with contents of the Local Plan in its entirety, it is at the very least a plan which can be reviewed, refined and measured. There appears to be little or no plan for the countryside, no plan for villages such as Nettleden and Little Gaddesden which already experience heavy traffic to and for Ashridge estate, no plan for the scarce water resources being used by an increasing number of inhabitants. This makes one both angry and incredibly sad. Our countryside is literally disappearing whilst we have our attention focussed elsewhere.</p> <p>23.216 We support this aspiration, as long as there is equal focus on how to increase the biodiversity and environmental well being of the countryside which we are not developing. It is a shameful fact that much of the farmed countryside landscape near London has lower levels of biodiversity than some areas of the "big smoke" itself.</p> <p>23.219. We strongly agree with the increased role and influence of local neighbourhood plans, which will allow those who live in these neighbourhoods to have their voice heard as to how best to balance our, at times, paradoxical social, economic and environmental priorities.</p>

23.228. We strongly support the development of higher levels of recreational space and new country and destination parks which will ease pressure on the CAOB and Ashridge in particular. We also strongly believe that there will need to be further mitigation measures with the National Trust to ameliorate the adverse effects of visitor pressure. To give a COVID example, the extremely understandable desire for people to visit the green lungs of Ashridge has already increased the traffic fall through our village of Nettleden. The addition of c.30,000 - 40,000 inhabitants in the area of HH, B'sted and Tring, with the attendant increase in the number of cars will place unbearable pressures on country roads. There needs to be active management of the transport systems, covering, but not limited to a) encouraging traffic to reach Ashridge via the main roads, rather than the small country roads within the state b) closing off some "rat runs" across country which are used to reach Ashridge and also by commuters travelling across country. c) increased provision of sustainable public transport and park and ride schemes, especially in HH. d) the increased provision of (electric) bike access e) increased open spaces outside Ashridge and the CAOB f) increased landscaping and biodiversity increase measures e.g. increase in hedgerows to scrub road pollution, smaller farming fields focussing on preventing soil erosion which accumulates in valleys such as are found around Nettleden, both clogging up the drains and reducing agricultural effectiveness. The list goes on, and the absence of specific measures in the local plan shouts out loud.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS1291

**Person ID** 1259116

**Full Name** Tring in Transition (TinT)

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1514
<b>Person ID</b>	1262216
<b>Full Name</b>	George Godar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Paras 23.218 and 219: it is important that villages (including Little Gaddesden) within the Chilterns AONB should be protected from infilling and development on the edge of the villages as this could affect their individual character.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS1931
<b>Person ID</b>	1262553
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Wallis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	No

<b>* No</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2167
<b>Person ID</b>	1261286
<b>Full Name</b>	John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> <b>* Yes</b> <b>* No</b>	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The delivery strategies for each area of development are based on out of date and false assumptions and as a result I believe will not deliver the perceived results.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2226
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy. Destruction of Green Belt, fields and woodland along the A41. You seem to have clear strategies for protecting the landscape until they get in the way of your planned developments at which point an exception is made in every case and building is allowed regardless of the cost to our green belt, fields and forests, light pollution etc. Yet again this plan seems to say the right things but in reality will do the opposite.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2432
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The plan does not account for the damage that will be suffered by villages around the plan. Increased traffic and other infrastructure demands will place undue strain on countryside living and alter it for the worse for ever
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2455
<b>Person ID</b>	1262981

<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Mabley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.212 What policies are in place to sustain agriculture in the green belt in its traditional form? The function of farmland goes beyond producing food and is intrinsic to the characteristic of the countryside.</p> <p>23.216 This sounds like permission to develop based on money and 23.217 opens a dangerous door to unscrupulous developers who will pretend they are creating a new rural community when in fact they are obliterating green fields, footpaths, hedges and trees and removing the buffer green belt between settlements.</p> <p>23.221 Bourne End Mills has already been re-developed under the last local plan, The proposed extension of the zone goes into land adjacent to the A41 the other side of Stoney Lane from and beyond the designation of the existing Bourne End Mills site. This means a hectare of land on the sloped bank of the trunk road with a swale for drainage within its area. This land is next to the hotel and service area developed in 1992 under outline plan 4/0377/90 and 4/00428/92 which designated limits on levels and fencing. In light of subsequent changes it would seem reasonable to say this land is still green belt as the inspector recommending the Act to permit construction of the A41 trunkroad in 1988 specifically stated that the road did not change the designation of the land it passed through. This means that hectare of land is green belt and without exceptional conditions of need it cannot be removed from that designation. While properties for the proposed uses remain vacant there can be no presumed need and the land has since acquired significant landscape and climate change value eg tree cover for carbon sequestration .</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2620
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS2642
<b>Person ID</b>	222269
<b>Full Name</b>	Georgina Tregoning
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3458
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124

<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3551
<b>Person ID</b>	1263821
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Isherwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	It is important that villages within the Chilterns AONB should be protected from infilling and development on their edges which could affect their individual character.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3751
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3885
<b>Person ID</b>	1263982
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa York
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	You are ruining our countryside

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3921
<b>Person ID</b>	1263971
<b>Full Name</b>	Nick Wiltshear
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I am commenting on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment November 2020, Dacorum Local Plan Addendum to AECOM site assessment study. As a resident of Long Marston I object to the proposal for the potential to build 3,481 dwellings around the village. It is clear that the area has not been visited as its beyond belief if it is thought the infrastucture and environment could sustain anything like this volume of housing. The road network is inadequate, the whole area is subject to flooding. The village is some distance from any main road and rail network to support the volume of traffic that a development of this size. Also the area has been identified in Dacorum Council own documentation as area of conservation due to the historic sites within it.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS3950
<b>Person ID</b>	1264025
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Sherwen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4022
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Cy04 - This is in the wrong place.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4164
<b>Person ID</b>	1262892
<b>Full Name</b>	Jean Farrer

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I don't regard your growth plan for using the Green Belt as modest. It is unnecessary and wrong for all the reasons I have set out in other sections. Just think of the benefits to Dacorum if we could be part of a Chiltern National Park. I ask you to refer to the CPRE and Chiltern Society submissions which I wholeheartedly support.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS4541
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	My family and I moved to Dacorum in 2018 to settle in Berkhamsted for at least the next 25 years. Over this time, we look forward to developing ever stronger links throughout the community and watching our young children grow to adulthood. As such, we have a vested interest in seeing the Borough grow in a way that works for all its citizens – both existing and new.  Against this backdrop, I wish to formally state my strong objections to the 'Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth'. The evidence suggests that, if this plan is approved, your personal legacy will be of considerably

worsening towns and communities within the Borough. For new residents moving to the area and for those already here. For all ages. And for all financial situations. I suspect you don't want to be remembered after you leave this office as the person who caused such damage to an area. So, I ask you to fundamentally rethink.

Due to the COVID-19 constraints on travel and mingling for the past year, my experience, and hence prime objection, focuses on the portions of the Local Plan relating to developments in the Berkhamsted area.

To summarise:

1. Flawed modelling of number and type of housing required would fail to meet the actual needs of the voters moving into the area, whilst disrupting those already here far more than is needed.
2. Inadequate commitment to transport infrastructure needs to accommodate the changes proposed would result in a legacy of decades of traffic congestion for voters in Dacorum and visitors to the area.
3. Insufficient provision of water supply, wastewater disposal and other infrastructure would leave households with shortages and damage the local water table, with knock-on considerations around subsidence and environmental impact.
4. Unworkable assumptions around public transport and foot / bike journeys would see considerable increase to carbon emissions in the Borough and considerable travel delays around vital transport hotspots (town centres, schools, rail stations, etc.).
5. The above worsening of conditions for the new and existing voters in the area also comes with an ecological cost due to the loss of green belt. If green belt is to be repurposed, it must be done in a way that makes the greatest positive impact for the current and future residents of Berkhamsted. This plan wastes that sacrifice.

These are fundamental flaws in the strategy underpinning the 'Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth'. As such, this plan should be rejected outright, and a new plan drawn up that addresses the actual needs of the area for today and the long-term success of the Borough.

These points are expanded below.

#### **Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision**

Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, the scale of proposed development in Dacorum is out of balance with the long-term needs.

The Local Plan does not take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6, which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Recent Government guidance on calculating housing need has been, at best, confusing. The algorithm for calculating housing need that has been used by the Council is a flawed means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough, based on old data.

The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. Instead, the Local Plan is based on calculations using outdated 2014 based ONS data, which results in a significant overestimate of housing needs.

I note that on 16 December 2020 the UK Government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system. This sets out important changes to the standard method which has been amended so that the 20 most populated cities and urban centres in England (none of which are in Dacorum) see their need uplifted by 35%. The Government also said:

"More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places. ...

Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."

### **Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure**

Looking at the proposed developments on Green Belt land, there is insufficient consideration in the Local Plan for the provision of new infrastructure or upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments.

Taking a specific example of transportation, consider area 'Bk01 - South of Berkhamsted'. This proposes adding 850 residential units with 2 ways out of the development:

1. Emerging immediately next to a secondary school of over 1300 pupils; and
2. Passing two primary schools on a single, narrow residential road with a 10% gradient and car parking on both sides.

These roads are heavily congested during normal times with the current population – the road by the secondary school backing up during school run times to the main A41 route into and out of the town. Adding 850 households of cars will lead to transport paralysis for the new residents, the homes already in the area, pupils of the schools and people trying to access Berkhamsted from the A41 during peak times.

Similarly, increasing the number of dwelling by over 1,800 in the Berkhamsted area will result in a considerable increase in vehicular traffic through the centre of the town – a route that is already heavily congested at peak times at the A4251 / A416 junction and along the High Street. This is due to the historic layout of the town along a valley with steep sides meaning there are only these two roads into and through the town.

For the increase in population proposed in the Local Plan, there would need to be a considerable extra investment in road widening, traffic flow control measures and new roads to bypass the congestion points inherent with a medieval market town situated in a steep river valley.

### **Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land**

The Local Plan states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB". This strategic principle is then violated by the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the Council's self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity.

Noting that 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns AONB, this approach comes at considerable environmental cost.

As such, the Local Plan must be fundamentally reworked to avoid such contradictions in strategic goals and principles.

You are now faced with a personal choice.

Whether to be remembered for taking the easy choice and sticking to an inherently flawed plan that will deeply damage the Borough of Dacorum forever – your lasting legacy – or to take the brave decision and do what is right – to reject the current plan and come back with one based on the actual needs of the current and future voters and households of Dacorum.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS4588

**Person ID** 1145918

**Full Name** Mr Richard Tregoning

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5171

<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5272
<b>Person ID</b>	1175740
<b>Full Name</b>	Berkhamsted Schools Group
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Berkhamsted Schools Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	1175743
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Kevin Rolfe
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Group Director, Development & Planning Aitchison Raffety
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<b>Policy SP29 - Delivering Growth in the Countryside</b>



We welcome the section that states "...we are supporting the relocation of the playing pitches to Berkhamsted School's Haresfoot Campus on the edge of Berkhamsted (Growth Area Cy04) to allow development of Haslam Playing Fields (Growth Area BK03) to proceed and to ensure no net loss of facilities in the town" and the accompanying table.

This section of the draft plan refers to areas of growth in the countryside. We are not sure that the provision of playing pitches is best described as "growth" as such, as in reality the relocation of sports pitches into this School land in the green belt is in accordance with long established GB policy. However, the formalisation of the matter is very welcome.

Given the current planning policy acceptability of the recreation use and the emerging supporting policy as well, the BSG intends to move forward with the detail of this Cy04 project in parallel with the later stages of the draft plan. We will be engaging with DBC officers via the pre-application process so that planning permission is granted at the earliest appropriate time. That will in turn ensure that the works at Haresfoot site Cy04 are implemented quickly and the provision at Haslam Field can be relocated shortly after the local plan adoption. The early delivery of housing at site BK03 is therefore readily achievable.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS5304

**Person ID** 1264532

**Full Name** Robert Clarke

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** No

\* Yes

\* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5506
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5566
<b>Person ID</b>	1264491
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5698
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	How does the plan not seek to fundamentally change the development strategy for the countryside? It will certainly not safeguard its intrinsic character, biodiversity and heritage assets, and key landscape features in its zoning as a protected area as stated in 23.215. Site 18 has a designated heritage asset and the plan is proposing to develop this land in contradiction to 23.215. there is nothing modest about building 200 houses in a green fields viewed from the Ashridge as 23.216 suggests.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5756
<b>Person ID</b>	1264473
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I read the sections (23.210-231) in the Countryside Delivery Strategy and marvel at the proposal to include the site at Long Marston in the Local Plan. It contravenes your stated aims here in its entirety - attractive landscape, agriculture, least sustainable because of limited facilities, poor accessability, limited public transport, safeguarding intrinsic character, sensitivity to change, biodiversity, heritage assets, tranquility of the countryside,..and yet you propose to include a site for 3,400 houses in open countryside outside Long Marston in your Plan
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5777
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS5910

<b>Person ID</b>	1264752
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6268
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6415
<b>Person ID</b>	1264750
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6427
<b>Person ID</b>	1264964
<b>Full Name</b>	Philip Heaphy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>Paras 23.218 and 219: it is important that villages (including Little Gaddesden) within the Chilterns AONB should be protected from infilling and development on the edge of the villages as this could affect their individual character.</i>

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6461
<b>Person ID</b>	1264982
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heaphy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<i>Paras 23.218 and 219: it is important that villages (including Little Gaddesden) within the Chilterns AONB should be protected from infilling and development on the edge of the villages as this could affect their individual character.</i>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6486
<b>Person ID</b>	1263462
<b>Full Name</b>	Bourne End
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We particularly seek support for our agriculture. Farms need to be acknowledged as intrinsic to our countryside not just as green field which developers see as a nice setting for lots of houses. During the Covid crisis the farm land around Bourne End has successfully catered for greater public accessibility on its footpaths, while worrying about quad bikes enjoying the off road experience of open fields. They should be acknowledged within the audit of assets in the countryside and helped to maintain that function, not allowed to develop into urban housing estates.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6508
<b>Person ID</b>	1264936
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Cracknell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6630
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6824
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Don't destroy the local villages surrounding Tring! They should be protected from developments as should the surrounding country side.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS6982

<b>Person ID</b>	1265058
<b>Full Name</b>	Rick Ansell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	There is already considerable pressure on the local countryside. Places such as Ivighow Beacon, the Ashridge Estate and Pitstone Hill are very heavily used. Increasing the local population will only increase the pressure on these areas, especially as there will be a contraction in the open countryside available. The Strategy does not identify how this will be addressed, other than by saying it will consult with the National Trust.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7036
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS7112
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><b>23.216 to ensure a prosperous rural economy and viable villages</b> - I am not convinced. How isd the building of more houses going to ensure that?</p> <p><b>23.220 New homes will support rural businesses, local shops and village facilities that offer a diverse range of services to meet day to day needs.</b> - Really?</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8128
<b>Person ID</b>	1266081
<b>Full Name</b>	Steven and Megan Reitz
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	In addition we are concerned that the reliance on quite a high number of windfall sites in the rural villages like ours (Potten end ) where no specific development has been planned will mean that more pressure will be put on village amenities but without any planned investment / capacity upgrade. Specifically the Potten end sewage system reached capacity some decades ago and often floods private properties with untreated sewage. There is no provision in the plan to address this even though there is an enthusiasm to encourage windfall development which will put additional pressure on an already overloaded system.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS8774
<b>Person ID</b>	1266776
<b>Full Name</b>	MICHAELA RYDE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

I am appalled and disgusted that councils and developers are continually allowed to build and develop on rural land, especially as England is trying to reach net zero emissions by 2050 by planting 30000 hectares of trees each year. The area you have selected is not only rural but it is agricultural land that is being rapidly engulfed by developments. Why aren't we planting trees, if anything, instead of permanently destroying acres of green land in an area in the middle of rural England with no infrastructure to support any further development in the area. You have chosen an area on the Herts, Beds, Bucks borders where there has already been excessive developments, locally in both Bucks and Beds. It is these two counties which will suffer if this development takes place, as the traffic will have to pass the tiny villages of Cheddington and Mentmore to reach Aylesbury and Leighton Buzzard. Developing these rural villages totally destroys the ethos of a village life, a huge part of our heritage, depriving a chosen lifestyle, turning them into small towns, without amenities. There is no infrastructure in place, no direct access to a major road meaning everyone living here will need their own transport. This will mean these small, narrow roads being overloaded with excess weight, speed and volume of traffic. These rural roads are far too small to cater for such. These rural roads, with no pavements or lights are also shared with pedestrians, equestrians, cyclists and numerous, free roaming wild life. Equestrians already have to contend with the HGVs coming out of Cheddington, Wingrave and Ledburn industrial sites, not to mention the new, ugly housing development in Cheddington and additional cars with drivers who have no appreciation of the slower pace and different lifestyle of rural life. What has been done to increase their safety since these monstrosities have evolved? NOTHING! The local train station has no capacity for more cars for commuters. Developments are killing the countryside. How are farmers expected to farm and England become sufficient to feed its population if it is continually developed? There are so many empty offices in urban areas, which have infrastructure in place, which could be developed into housing. Rural life, is slower paced, larger gardens, fewer people. It's a lifestyle which is being rapidly destroyed. Oregon in the USA is approximately the size of England and is home to 3 million people. England has approximately 62 million. Food for thought. Stop going for the easy, but most eco damaging option and look at the urban alternatives. They are not making any more land. KEEP THE COUNTRY COUNTRY

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS8788

**Person ID** 334036

**Full Name** Cllr Terry Douris

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I write as the councillor for the Ashridge Ward.</p> <p>I am persuaded that we need to re-consider our response to the numbers handed down by MHCLG. Given that we have allocated almost all of our Brownfield space the only option is to consider the Green Belt however it seems that there is a level of uncertainty in the Dept. comments.</p> <p>I support the motion on 18th November and the letter from the Leader of the Council on 30th November. Although there is no growth shown in Ashridge Ward I do have severe concerns relating to traffic flows in the short, medium and long term. The structure of Potten End, Nettleden and Little Gaddesden villages will be damaged especially as they are surrounded by a number of weight limit zones which inevitably will drive vehicles through the remaining but inappropriate rural roads.</p> <p>I appreciate the need for housing especially with the numbers on our housing waiting lists and whilst I accept that there must be housing developments, they need to be relevant to the demographic makeup and more sensitively placed so that they do not fundamentally damage the natural place within rural communities.</p> <p>I very much hope that further consideration is given to place shaping across Dacorum to preserve the existing environment and that the council will take a robust position including a further Reg18 consultation as I feel it is likely to be required.</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9132
<b>Person ID</b>	1267107
<b>Full Name</b>	Gilda La Bella
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>With this email I want to express my opinion on the project of a new Local Plan that looks ahead to 2038</p> <p>I oppose the plan due to the use of Green Belt land, the negative transformational change in the nature of the area, insufficient detail on critical issues such as infrastructure and sustainability, lack of commitment to protect small villages and hamlets in the Borough from increased traffic.</p> <p>As a result of the proposed development Hemel Hempstead's traffic flow problems will then impact Water End, Great Gaddesden, Potten End and Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The Plan cannot be described as "sustainable" given its distance from existing infrastructure with no plans to guarantee improved and sustainable solutions. Why were other sites that are immediately adjacent to existing sustainable transport infrastructure not considered?</p> <p>My feeling is that the Plan will undermine the quality of life for local residents and deprive the community of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9813
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p><u>Lead Local Flood Authority</u>. It should be noted that flood risk also exists in rural Steep areas of farmland adjacent to developments can generate large volumes of run-off leading, to localised flooding. Flood risk should therefore be assessed for such areas. Infill in existing settlements needs to be screened, in order to make sure surface water flow routes are not being compromised.</p> <p><u>Transport</u>. Within this section, the county council would welcome the inclusion that the countryside will support intra settlement sustainable travel through the use of existing and new public highway, rights of way and green spaces for all types of trips/journeys. Acknowledgement of HCC's Rights of Way improvement plan and countryside teams would be welcomed</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS9967
<b>Person ID</b>	211262
<b>Full Name</b>	Katherine and Stuart Higgins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>We are residents of Dacorum and strongly object to the number of houses planned to be built in our area. In addition to an extreme amount of in-fill which has already taken place todate across our area, it is totally unacceptable to propose building on green fields and on Green Belt land.</p> <p>This land is crucial to the balance of our communities and wildlife and preserving our green spaces is essential for our future generations. Once built on we cannot reverse it.</p>



We already experience large volumes of traffic through our village and this has already increased significantly over the 14 years we have lived here. The proposed plan will only put more pressure on our roads and negatively impact on air quality.

There are also regular collisions in our village (Potten End) which will only rise with greater traffic as we will be used as a cut through for new commuters.

In terms of pressure on local services it doesn't seem this has been fully thought through. The schools provision, the local GP surgeries, sewerage, parking etc...how are local services supposed to cope with such an increase in population?

We couldn't even get our daughter into the secondary school we wanted as the local schools were hugely oversubscribed and now have to fund an independent school.

Our GP surgery has seen a huge increase in the number of residents they are expected to support. What plans are in place to provide extra GP's and facilities?

Why has Hemel Hempstead and St Albans Hospitals seen a deliberate downgrading of services over recent years and yet an increase in population?

Why would you propose more residents when we can't currently provide full Hospital services? We have to go to Watford, half an hour away which is acknowledged to be old, in need of re-building, and sub-standard provision for the 21st century?

As we aren't going to get a new (much needed) hospital, but a patch up of the current ailing one; how can we honestly support such a large programme of building and therefore population increase. It makes no sense to overburden an already struggling area.

Even fundamental services such as sewerage need significant investment into Potten End and I imagine other areas in Dacorum. We have a number of roads which have and continue to flood regularly and still haven't been sorted. How can our infrastructure deal with more???

I'm only touching the surface of the reasons why Dacorum should NOT have to build the number of properties proposed. Please take our views seriously. This isn't the best way forward.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS10545

**Person ID** 1268671

**Full Name** Mr Mike Jennings

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

The delivery strategies are inappropriate because the premise of the housing need / development growth is not sustainable and lacks justification because the council has over estimated the requirement for growth, exceeding the Governments requirements. Dacorum is a Borough with a large area identified as of environmental importance. The present demands on the environment are causing a deterioration in the environment. Hence the proposed growth will further damage the environment, especially around Tring and Berkhamsted. Mitigation measures are required that will result in Net Environmental Gain NEG (as identified in the NPPF). A high quality environment surrounds these towns, albeit deteriorating due to current recreational pressures. Sufficient measures to provide NEG are not feasible within the local environment. Offsetting the impacts elsewhere will not compensate for the impacts on the local environment. This will inevitably lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the SAC, SSSI's and local areas of importance to biodiversity.

These adverse impacts do not comply with the local policies and national legislation.

Delivery strategies in the plan need to take into account the latest information with respect to carbon, nitrogen and nutrient neutrality issues (In Practice December 2020, Page 6 Nutrient neutrality; Air pollution Pages 7-10; Nitrogen pollution Pages 11 - 14). The reference provided has other articles that are also relevant in the context of all local plans.

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS10618
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>23.215 (Countryside Delivery Strategy) “<i>The Plan does not seek any fundamental change to the development strategy for the countryside. It will remain an area of</i></p> <p><b><i>development restraint in order to safeguard its intrinsic character, biodiversity and heritage assets, and key landscape features in accordance with its zoning as a Protected Area. The countryside is covered by the Green Belt and Rural Area policies which seek to limit the scope and scale of new development and use of land.</i></b>”</p> <p><b><i>There is a contradiction here, in that any countryside areas in which DBC plan to drastically alter the intrinsic character, biodiversity, heritage assets or key landscape features will first be removed from the area considered to be ‘countryside’. It is unquestionably the case that development sites in the Green Belt, (for instance HH01, Hemel Garden Community) are counter to policy 23.215.</i></b></p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11024

<b>Person ID</b>	1268909
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Leslie Kennedy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	The Strategies do not properly consider the impact on neighbouring districts & counties
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS11431
<b>Person ID</b>	1269025
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN MAWER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>1 <b>Delivery strategy – Countryside</b>  23.222 The issue of expanding Bourne End’s industrial contribution has already been addressed and is further raised below.</p> <p>23.223 This is currently not controlled and relates to the above point. Buildings are erected under the guise of agricultural purposes then in a very short time become used for other purposes. This practice needs to be curtailed.</p>

<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS12890
<b>Person ID</b>	1269665
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Hicks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>Countryside Delivery Strategy</p> <p>The supporting statements 23.211-213 reflect the importance of, and changing nature and functionality of, traditional land uses. Recognition of this is welcome as it demonstrates the inability of the planning process to influence such changes meaningfully. Unfortunately, this also means that the aims of sustainable development cannot possibly be met, as the social, economic and environmental function of the countryside are clearly going to change, as stated; these changes are invariably negative, despite the damaging impacts of modern farming although the importance of addressing environmental concerns is even more critical and remains dependent upon positive land management. Although this is one plan which at last recognises the major drivers for these lie outside the planning system (I have always stated policies don't eat grass).</p> <p>23.228 recognises the damaging ecological consequences of urban population growth – ironically proposed by this plan. New country parks are wholly aspirational, light pollution and urbanisation is not (23.229). Tranquillity (23.231) is a major consideration but no evidence to inform this aspect is presented, despite the issue having been raised generally for 25+ years by some (me). Consequently, more work is needed to fully inform and support a sustainable approach to these issues and develop a plan which actually does enable genuine sustainable development.</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS13693
<b>Person ID</b>	1270356
<b>Full Name</b>	Lucy Tannett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<p>I wish to make my objection to the above proposed plans very clear.</p> <p>The underlying analysis of the plan, I believe I, is lacking and inconsistent. Potten End (the village where I live) will become hugely impacted by traffic. There was meant to be leafleting of the houses in Potten End to inform us of these plans - no one that I know received any information whatsoever.</p> <p>The housing targets contained in the plan are more than double what we have at the moment in Dacorum. It involves widespread building on Green Belt, increasing the size of Berko by 25% and Tring by 50%!</p> <p>On our doorstep, a large development of 1500 homes would be built on reclaimed Green Belt north of Hemel, which - combined with some strange plans for travel between the A41 and the M1- would inevitably mean an increase in traffic through our village.</p> <p>Please reconsider this application.</p>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14172
<b>Person ID</b>	1270552
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Friend
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	I strongly object to the council completely desecrating the countryside, listed as an area of natural beauty, by building three thousand dwellings at Long Marston. Spoiling the beautiful countryside for generations to come. Please rethink this
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14492
<b>Person ID</b>	1270679
<b>Full Name</b>	GLENEDEN PLANT SALES LTD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270678
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	MR WILLIAM LLOYD
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	DLP PLANNING LTD
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	We are content with draft Policy SP29 setting out that modest growth in the countryside locations will be acceptable. However, our representation relates to the fact that brownfield land is not mentioned in the draft Policy wording, despite the benefits that this will provide through the preservation of the best countryside land. We would expect the draft Policy to reference brownfield land and how this will be utilised to support growth in the countryside locations as a first priority.
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14614
<b>Person ID</b>	1270715
<b>Full Name</b>	Sunil Tandon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Park Garage Group PLC
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264313
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	James Hodgkins
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Simply Planning Ltd
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	Please refer to the supporting consultation representations, prepared by Simply Planning Limited
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Countryside Delivery Strategy
<b>ID</b>	EGS14620
<b>Person ID</b>	1270726
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Renshaw Watts
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Pennard Bare Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270725
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr David Carlisle
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	AECOM
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



## Countryside Delivery Strategy comment

The Flamstead sites (parcels 53 and 55) offer a contrast in location to the spatial distribution of growth put forward in the consultation document (November 2020) and would help to provide a less homogenous land supply pipeline. The sites are in single landownership and are available immediately to deliver in the first five years.

Paragraph 19.10 of the consultation document identifies a number of small villages, including Flamstead, and acknowledges that there is a need to allow for limited development in these location to support their existing roles within the settlement hierarchy. However, no residential allocations are proposed and this approach would be reliant on windfall sites within the settlement boundary.

Policy SP29 - Delivering Growth in the Countryside allocates Proposal Site Cy03 - Watling Street Truck Stop, London Road, Flamstead for employment uses. Therefore the principle of deallocating Green Belt land in Flamstead to meet wider DBC needs and requirements has been established for employment in this location. Our clients contend that the decision to deallocate this employment allocation from the Green Belt supports the principle that sustainable residential development should also be deallocated from the Green Belt in this location. Especially when considering the existing village services available (nursery, pre-school, primary school, post office/local shop, sports pitches and community facilities); and accessibility to public transport, Markyate and the M1.

Policy SP3 of the Emerging Growth Strategy document refers to the settlement hierarchy and identifies Flamstead as being a 'Small Village within the Green Belt'. Whilst the village itself does provide a lower level of facilities compared to the markets towns and largest villages, the village has a number of key facilities and benefits from a close functional relationship with nearby Markyate, a 'Large Village' described as declining and identified for further growth. Furthermore, the Local Plan acknowledges that some of the settlements referred to as 'Small Villages in the Green Belt' can offer development opportunities to support their existing role within the settlement hierarchy. This statement is made with regards to existing settlement boundaries and may not consider appropriate sites on the edge of settlements. Infill development on the edge of Flamstead is considered appropriate in this context.

The policy wording of policy SP2 specifies that the Council will not support additional growth beyond what is outlined in the policy. This is overly restrictive and would mean that appropriate sites such as those put forward in this letter may not come forward in the plan period despite a pressing need for new housing and near doubling of the housing target.

Furthermore, Policy SP12 limits development in rural areas (beyond the Green Belt) for housing to three locations (Aldbury, Long Marston and Wilstone) limiting any other development in villages washed over by Green Belt, even where they are demonstrably more sustainable locations for growth (such is the case with Flamstead as evidenced by the Settlement Hierarchy Study Main Report (October 2017)).

Policy DM39 refers to limited infilling in selected Small Villages in the Green Belt, including Flamstead. Planning permission will be granted for infilling if they meet all of the policy's criteria including criteria (a), that the site falls within the envelope of the small village. The emerging strategy acknowledges that although the NPPF allows for limited levels of infilling in Green Belt villages (paragraph 145) it does not define 'limited' and 'villages'. As such, both are open to interpretation in a specific context.

Furthermore, it is noted that the village envelope was amended under the previous 2004 Local Plan. As drafted this policy would exclude our client's landholdings due to the current extent of the settlement boundary (see Figure 2) even

though both would represent sustainable infill. The emergence of a new Local Plan offers an opportunity to review these settlement boundaries afresh. It would make sense to include all adjacent buildings which are contiguous with the village, including the dwellings on Singlets Lane and Delmer End Lane. Further, should parcels 53 and 55 be allocated in the Local Plan the settlement boundary should encompass them also.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS14856

**Person ID** 1270808

**Full Name** Westmorland Limited

**Organisation Details** Westmorland Ltd

**Agent ID** 1270759

**Agent Full Name** Miss  
Hanna  
Mawson

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

Paragraph 23.225-6 acknowledges the NPPF’s recognition of the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities (paragraph 107). It goes on to states that *“Local and national studies have also identified a critical shortfall in HGV parking in and around the M1 This in part reflects local problems experienced by the Maylands Business Park with regards to heavy freight movement and with it associated pressure for overnight lorry parking”*. It goes on to set out that through discussions with the landowner, County Council and Highways England the suitability of expanding the existing Watling Street Truckstop is being explored to provide additional lorry parking to meet local and wider demand, improved on- site facilities and access arrangement (Growth Area Cy03). The supporting text acknowledges that the site is partially previously developed land and strategically located close to M1 Junction 9. The text also acknowledges the sites Green Belt location and the importance of securing enhanced landscaping and screening to the site. The accompanying Vision Document sets out how this could be achieved at the site.

Policy SP29 Delivering Growth in the Countryside identifies Watling Street Truckstop, Flamstead as Growth Area allocation Cy03 (Transport) for new/enhanced lorry park with associated facilities. The draft proposals map shows the area covered by this As referenced in relation to Policy SP11, it would assist if this policy made clear that this would involve an extension

to the existing facility in line with the area identified on the draft proposals map. The policy should also clarify what the proposed redevelopment/enhancement will comprise of, for example, comprehensive redesign including a new and larger facilities building and an increase in HGV parking provision.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15168

**Person ID** 1270992

**Full Name** REVD JOHN RUSSELL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Countryside Delivery Strategy comment**

As Vicar of the parish of Great Gaddesden, which includes Jockey End and Gaddesden Row, I am writing to express my concern over the recently published Local Development Plan and the negative impact it is likely to have on the parish and existing residents. I am concerned that at a time of Lockdown, such a major decision should be taken, when it is so difficult to engage fully with the wider community for a proper discussion and consultation.

The proposed plan would result in the urbanisation of a parish that is mostly made up of agriculture land and woodland and sits in an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB), and would cover almost a fifth of the parish and reach right to the border of the AONB. Environmental impacts of sound, light and noise alone would do significant damage to the natural beauty of the AONB and have a very damaging effect on the green belt and also on the Chiltern area of outstanding natural beauty.

We already suffer quite badly from littering, fly tipping, and traffic, despite the down grading of what was the A4146. I do not see how the infrastructure will cope with the increased demands which will undoubtedly be put upon it.

I urge you to examine the reuse of brownfield sites, rather than expand out further, thus losing some 2000 acres of green belt land and open spaces . The green spaces promised, will result in the loss of 900 - acres of the existing green belt land which seems counter intuitive.

Management of water which is not really under control now will only suffer further, both in terms of shortages at times and further flooding at others, more development can only put even greater pressure on this fragile resource and have a serious and permanent environmental impact.

The plan talks about 'developing the transport proposals' but currently the area does not appear to have any so that will only result in more road traffic on already overcrowded roads. If traffic is to be di-vert ed away from the A414 during the construction of a m-ss passenger transport system toward the proposed new link road then the existing Dagnall Road at Water End {a single lane over a narrow bridge

and scene of frequent accidents) would become totally congested. The reality is that Water End would become untenable to live in or move through in this area of outstanding natural beauty.

For these reasons I state my objections to the proposals and urge Dacorum to re-examine them.

**Countryside Delivery Strategy upload**

**Included files**

**Title** Countryside Delivery Strategy

**ID** EGS15331

**Person ID** 1271128

**Full Name** Little Gaddesden Parish Council c/o Cllr John Saner

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

* <b>No</b>	
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like the Plan expressly to provide Little Gaddesden with the same protection from development as exists under the current Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy (2013), under which development is constrained by Policy CS7.</li> <li>• We would like to see in the Plan a stated intention that the area of land on the south side of Church Road from the Bowls Club car park to the hedge beyond and opposite the church and the fields to the south (all of which is shown edged red on the plan attached ) will be designated as a Local Green Space on which no development will be permitted. This area of land between the village of Little Gaddesden and the church is of special historic interest and value to Little Gaddesden and designation as Open Green Space would protect the openness of the land and the uninterrupted view of the church from the village.</li> </ul>
<b>Countryside Delivery Strategy upload</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	