

Local Plan 2011 -2031

Representations Detailed

Summary Report

Consultation on the Local Plan Preferred Options ran from 18 December 2014 to 6 February 2015. In total in excess of 8,500 representations were received from over 4,500 landowners, developers, community organisations, business interests and individual members of the public. From the representations received, more than 7,400 representations were made in respect of Chapter 12 which included the Local Plan Preferred Options sites. The remainder (more than 1,100 representations) were made in respect of the policy chapters.

Representations received in respect of the Local Plan Preferred Options were evenly spread throughout the District of North Hertfordshire and beyond. Representors from Hitchin, Luton, Baldock and Letchworth Garden City submitted a large proportion of the overall number of representations. Representors with addresses in Hitchin provided 20% of the overall number, followed by Luton (11.7%), Baldock (10.3%) and Letchworth Garden City (8.8%). A detailed summary of all the representations submitted in response to this consultation has been prepared and is available on request.

The following document sets out a summary of the key issues raised during the consultation period. The Council considers that in the interest of delivering sustainable development in North Hertfordshire that a robust and sound Local Plan is adopted as quickly as practicable, consistent with government advice. The Preferred Options, with amendments as a result of analysing the representations, evidently provides a robust starting point for the way in which this can happen.

Introduction – Introductory Paragraphs (Pages 5 and 6 – including paragraphs 1.1 to 1.10)

North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 Preferred Options December 2014			
Number of Respondents	36	Number of Objections	21
Number of General Comments	12	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- The Plan has missed key points of the NPPF.
- The Plan does not represent the best interests of the District.
- The Plan lacks transparency.

1 Introduction			
Number of Respondents	20	Number of Objections	6
Number of General Comments	13	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Concerns were raised over the Plan's evidence base.
- It is considered that the plan has been positively prepared and is based on robust and credible evidence.
- The housing number is unfounded.
- There is not enough employment land proposed in North Hertfordshire.

Vision and Objectives (Pages 7 to 9 – including paragraphs 2.1 to 2.7)

2 Visions and Objectives			
Number of Respondents	37	Number of Objections	14
Number of General Comments	17	Number of Supports	6

Summary of comments

- The Plan lacks a clear Vision statement.
- The NPPF is misinterpreted.
- The Vision and Objectives fail to recognise the distinctiveness of the different towns in North Hertfordshire.
- There is no reference to the wider cross district/regional impacts of the Plan.
- The objectives fail to mention the historic environment in Figure 1.
- The infrastructure provision for transport, waste management and water supply has not been fully thought out.
- The objectives for landscape (Figure 1) should be strengthened to reflect the delivery of local character and 'sense of place', green infrastructure, high quality design, public health, a thriving economy, climate change mitigation and adaptation and the provision of ecosystem services.

Policy SD1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development (Pages 8 and 9 – including paragraphs 2.8)

Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development			
Number of Respondents	17	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- The Policy does not refer to the historic environment.
- There is no clarification of sustainable development in the Preferred Options and what it means for the District.

Economy & Town Centres (Page 10 – including paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6)

3 Economy & Town Centres			
Number of Respondents	30	Number of Objections	12
Number of General Comments	17	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- There are no details with regard to regeneration opportunities.
- More independent shops are needed.
- Businesses should be encouraged.
- Town centres should encourage greater range of community, cultural and leisure uses as well as shopping.
- Plan should give proper consideration to how the residents will access shops and retail stores.

Policy ETC1 – Provision and distribution of employment land (Pages 10 to 12 - including paragraphs 3.7 to 3.14)

Policy ETC1: Provision and distribution of employment land			
Number of Respondents	18	Number of Objections	6
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- There should be more recognition of Royston's contribution to the Cambridge sub-region.
- The policy fails to recognise Luton as a key employment centre.
- More of the employment land should be allocated for housing.
- Will this policy lead to an increase in out-commuting?

Policy ETC2 – Promoting the knowledge economy (Pages 12 and 13 – including paragraphs 3.15 and 3.16)

Policy ETC2: Promoting the knowledge economy			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- General support.
- The policy is not specific enough.
- There needs to be recognition of the environmental impacts associated with the IT industry.

Policy ETC3 – Appropriate uses in employment areas (Pages 13 to 15 – including paragraphs 3.17 to 3.23)

Policy ETC3: Appropriate uses in employment areas			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- Uncertainty over whether travel plans will be delivered.
- Amending the word 'resist' to 'refuse' would bring the policy in line with the NPPF.

Policy ETC 4 - Employment development outside employment areas (Pages 15 and 16 – including paragraphs 3.24 to 3.26)

Policy ETC4: Employment development outside employment areas			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Support for the policy, particularly the flexible approach.
- Employment generating opportunities should be more actively encouraged.
- This policy needs far greater work to clarify what it means in reference to rural development.

Policy ETC5 – Tourism (Pages 16 and 17 – including paragraphs 3.27 to 3.32)

Policy ETC5: Tourism			
Number of Respondents	14	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	12	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Tourism is under invested in North Hertfordshire.
- Sustainability in terms of access should not be used as a reason to depress rural tourist destinations.
- Reference should be made to the impact on rural communities from any proposed developments.
- Sites LG1 and LG3 jeopardise the tourism appeal of Letchworth Garden City.
- There is no reference to the historic environment despite noting that several historic assets are important attractions for visitors to the district.

Policy ETC6 - Town and Local Centres (Pages 17 to 19 – including paragraphs 3.33 to 3.38)

Policy ETC6: Town and Local Centres			
Number of Respondents	9	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- This chapter lacks detail of any regeneration opportunities within the town centres relating to retail, leisure and/or commercial activities. There is an opportunity to conserve, enhance and restore the historic environment.
- Churchgate shopping centre would provide a key opportunity to reinforce and repair the historic character of the town centre.
- It would be useful to clarify the town centre uses permitted which would be in accordance with the NPPF.
- Recognition of the four town centres distinctiveness and character needs to be clarified within the policy.

Policy ETC7 - Additional retail floorspace (Pages 19 and 20 – including paragraphs 3.39 to 3.45)

Policy ETC7: Additional retail floorspace			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Satisfied with the Council's priority on filling vacant shops.
- Policy has no detail with regards to regeneration opportunities.

Policy ETC8 - New retail, leisure and other town centre development (Pages 21 and 22 – including paragraphs 3.46 to 3.51)

Policy ETC8: New retail, leisure and other town centre development			
Number of Respondents	4	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- There are a number of roads in Hitchin and Letchworth town centres with a higher proportion of vacant properties. These roads could be taken out of the town centre zoning with long-term empty properties brought back into use for the community.
- The policy failed to mention community uses or facilities.

Policy ETC9 - Primary and secondary shopping frontages (Pages 22 to 24 – including paragraphs 3.52 to 3.57)

Policy ETC9: Primary and secondary shopping frontages			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Support for the policy as it reflects what has been happening in recent years and will allow for greater flexibility of use.
- Lack of primary frontage in Baldock which makes it not suitable for expansion.
- The stance on Class A3 (restaurants) is queried. There should be greater flexibility with respect to restaurant uses.

Policy ETC10 – Local Centres (Pages 24 and 25 – including paragraphs 3.58 to 3.64)

Policy ETC10: Local centres			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Ashwell should not be categorised as a Local Centre when compared with Knebworth and Codicote.
- Clothall Common has no local centre and should be considered for future expansion.
- There is a lack of clarity regarding the provision of community and health facilities.

Policy ETC11 - Scattered local shops, services and facilities in towns and villages (Pages 25 and 26 – including paragraphs 3.65 to 3.69)

Policy ETC11: Scattered local shops, services and facilities in towns and villages			
Number of Respondents	4	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- The policy should go further and offer business rate relief to shops serving a community of less than 500 houses.
- Policy ETC11 is clear, and welcomed.

Countryside and Green Belt (Page 27 – including paragraphs 4.1 to 4.2)

4 Countryside and Green Belt			
Number of Respondents	34	Number of Objections	21
Number of General Comments	12	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Support the recognition that future development needs to provide the exceptional circumstances required by Paragraph 83 of the NPPF to review the Green Belt and set new boundaries through the local plan process.
- There is no mention of the importance of the countryside as a habitat for wildlife and the need to protect and enhance biodiversity.
- Support the recognition of the needs of the rural population and rural economy.
- The wording of paragraph 4.2 is too general and could be potentially challenged.

Policy CGB1 – Green Belt (Page 27 – including paragraphs 4.3 to 4.4)

Policy CGB1: Green Belt			
Number of Respondents	68	Number of Objections	31
Number of General Comments	26	Number of Supports	11

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council supports the amendment of the Green belt boundary on the northern side of Hitchin.
- The policy makes a mockery of the Green Belt.
- Para 4.17 definition of ‘harm’ needs expanding to include negative impacts on local character and amenity. Policy should acknowledge that the NPPF encourages planning positively for beneficial use of Green Belt – landscapes, biodiversity, visual amenity
- More effort needs to be made to find non green belt sites.
- The policy is not consistent with the NPPF.
- There is confusion where the Green Belt is being amended.
- A distinction between countryside and Green Belt needs to be made.

Policy CGB2 – Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt (Pages 27 and 28 – including paragraph 4.5)

Policy CGB2: Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt			
Number of Respondents	14	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- This policy uses the same wording as CGB1 and seeks to apply this to non green belt areas undermining the effect of green belt policy and is therefore unsound. The policy needs to reflect the difference between green belt and other rural/countryside areas.
- The policy is too broad brush and should deal with the specifics of visual amenity, biodiversity, agricultural quality and heritage.

Policy CGB3 - Exception sites in the rural area (Pages 28 and 29 – including paragraphs 4.6 to 4.9)

Policy CGB3: Exception sites in the rural area			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Policy duplicates the NPPF and should be deleted.
- There are no references to Neighbourhood Plans.

Policy CGB4 – Rural Workers’ Dwellings (Pages 29 and 30 – including paragraphs 4.10 to 4.15)

Policy CGB4: Rural Workers' Dwellings			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Policy needs strengthening to avoid these dwellings leaking onto the open market, potentially requiring them to be converted to affordable housing if no longer needed.
- Policy duplicates the NPPF and should be deleted.

Policy CGB5 – Existing Rural buildings (Pages 30 and 31 – including paragraphs 4.16 to 4.19)

Policy CGB5: Existing Rural buildings			
Number of Respondents	12	Number of Objections	4
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No references to neighbourhood plans.
- The policy title is misleading as rural buildings are not usually taken to include dwellings.
- While Policy CGB5 is sensible for single buildings any such development must take into account sustainability. If not, this policy could lead to substantial new housing without the concomitant infrastructure.
- Policy duplicates the NPPF and should be deleted.

Transport (Page 32 – including paragraphs 5.1 to 5.6)

5 Transport			
Number of Respondents	28	Number of Objections	18
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- NHDC need to address the growth at Samuel Lucas School and the residential developments in Hitchin.
- There is a need to look at the wider and traffic implications of the Hitchin sites.
- Traffic in Hitchin already high at peak times and will increase with new housing in West of Hitchin.
- Policy needs to take into account sustainable transport, shift away from motorised vehicular transport such as shared car use through car clubs.
- There is a need to look at local traffic movement.
- The transport policy is vague and woolly.
- Policy needs to look at public transport / train service issues for the towns such as Baldock.
- There is a need to sort out the transport issues on the A1(M) otherwise development isn't going to be sustainable.
- The policy needs to be clear as to what sustainable transport is.

Policy T1 – Sustainable Transport (Pages 32 and 33 – including paragraphs 5.7)

Policy T1: Sustainable transport			
Number of Respondents	27	Number of Objections	11
Number of General Comments	16	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The commitment to sustainable transport (T1) is supported.
- The term 'sustainable journeys' is not clear.

Policy T2 – Parking (Pages 33 and 34 – including paragraphs 5.8 to 5.12)

Policy T2: Parking			
Number of Respondents	15	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Time has proven that lack of parking provision is not effective in reducing the quantity of private cars.

Housing and development strategy (Page 35 – including paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2)

6 Housing and development strategy			
Number of Respondents	36	Number of Objections	15
Number of General Comments	15	Number of Supports	6

Summary of comments

- Support the aim to protect the largely rural character of the remainder of the District however protection in itself is not enough. The means to maintain the management that creates and sustains this character is equally important if the quality of the rural character is to be conserved.

Policy HDS1 - Housing targets 2011-2031 (Pages 35 to 37 – including paragraphs 6.3 to 6.16)

Policy HDS1: Housing targets 2011-2031			
Number of Respondents	64	Number of Objections	31
Number of General Comments	28	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- The policy would be enhanced by a reference that reflects the cross boundary nature of the plan.
- There should be an acknowledgement that West of Stevenage would not just be about meeting housing need but also about the economic prosperity of the town.
- The source of the housing figure is unclear.
- There needs to be more information on housing mix and how existing housing stock could be improved.
- How is North Hertfordshire District Council addressing the issue of persistent under delivery?

Policy HDS2 - Settlement hierarchy (Pages 37 to 39 – including paragraphs 6.17 to 6.25)

Policy HDS2: Settlement hierarchy			
Number of Respondents	57	Number of Objections	19
Number of General Comments	25	Number of Supports	13

Summary of comments

- Both category A and B villages should be given village boundaries.
- The policy is not clear enough with regard to the Category A villages and what will be allowed where.

- Uncertainty over the criteria for the categorisation of villages and the consequent effects that this may have on the villages and settlements that are not permitted to grow and the consequent loss of facilities and community.
- The boundaries around the Category A villages have been drawn too tightly to allow for this policy to have effect, i.e. there is nowhere for general development to take place.

Policy HDS3 - Affordable Housing (Pages 40 and 41 – including paragraphs 6.26 to 6.34)

Policy HDS3: Affordable Housing			
Number of Respondents	35	Number of Objections	6
Number of General Comments	22	Number of Supports	7

Summary of comments

- Concerned that the relative affordability of each town has not been taken into account in the distribution of development.
- Policy wording is too strict.
- The policy needs to be more closely related to paragraph 50 of the NPPF regarding onsite and offsite affordable housing.
- Uncertainty regarding the source of the affordable housing figure.
- The supporting text allows for viability to be considered but the wording of the policy does not.
- The policy should be reworded to reflect that the figure is a target and not a requirement.
- The policy fails to mention sheltered housing provision.

Policy HDS4 – Density (Pages 41 and 42 – including paragraphs 6.35 to 6.36)

Policy HDS4: Density			
Number of Respondents	16	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- ‘Lower’, ‘high’ and ‘very high’ need to be defined.
- The policy wording needs to be reviewed.

Policy HDS5 - Relatives' and dependants' accommodation (Pages 42 – including paragraphs 6.37 and 6.38)

Policy HDS5: Relatives' and dependants' accommodation			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Support for the policy but question the need for point 4.

Policy HDS6 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (Pages 43 and 44 – including paragraphs 6.39 to 6.43)

Policy HDS6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The Gypsy & Traveller strategy is unclear. It appears to only make provision up to 2028.
- It is unclear whether the policy refers to mains sewers or to any form of foul drainage including non-mains.
- The policy is too specific.
- Point 2 specifies that residents must have access to local shops but this restriction is not being applied to other types of development.

Design (Page 45 – including paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2)

7 Design			
Number of Respondents	13	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- In line with NPPF paragraph 62, there is an opportunity to also reference the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel within this chapter, alongside the existing reference to Building Futures and the Sustainable Design Toolkit.
- Consistent standards will be required where development sites lie across the administrative boundary or abut the existing urban area
- Support the emphasis on ensuring designs to improve the character and quality of an area as a means of minimising impacts on the environment. The character and quality of a given area should also include its ecological characteristics both past and present, as these too contribute to a sense of place and local distinctiveness.

Policy D1 – Design and Sustainability (Pages 45 to 47 – including paragraphs 7.3 to 7.15)

Policy D1: Design and Sustainability			
Number of Respondents	24	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	18	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Consistent standards will be required where development sites lie across the administrative boundary or abut the existing urban area.
- It should be ensured that policies in this section are not undermined by prevailing permitted development and prior approval rights and processes.
- 7.12 Secured by Design principles have been removed from the SBD website (www.securedbydesign.com) due to confusion with adoption of principles rather than the standards.
- In line with NPPF paragraph 62, there is an opportunity to also reference the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel within this chapter, alongside the existing reference to Building Futures and the Sustainable Design Toolkit.
- Policy wording is vague. Policy wording amendments required.
- Remove reference to SPD.
- No clear analysis of the towns and proposals to suit their individual problems, characters and needs.

Policy D2 - House Extensions and Replacement Dwellings (Pages 47 and 48 – including paragraphs 7.16 and 7.17)

Policy D2: House Extensions and Replacement Dwellings			
Number of Respondents	8	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Design criteria should also apply to house extensions and replacement buildings.
- Policy wording needs to be amended to strengthen policy.
- Paragraph 7.17 is unrealistic.

Policy D3 – Protecting living conditions (Page 48 – including paragraphs 7.18 to 7.21)

Policy D3: Protecting living conditions			
Number of Respondents	11	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Noise during construction should also be included.
- Suggest including protection of sunlight to photovoltaic and solar hot water installations, protection of those sites from overshadowing.
- Policy wording needs to be amended.

Policy D4 - Air quality (Pages 49 to 51 – including paragraphs 7.22 to 7.31)

Policy D4: Air quality			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- In the context of paragraph 193 of the NPPF, Policy D4 is vague in terms of the 'relevant' types of development proposals that will be required to produce air pollution impact assessments, and as such, should be amended.
- Furthermore, the policy is limiting and should be revised to allow for both the outcome of the air pollution impact assessment and 'other relevant, up-to-date evidence' to be considered in the determining of an application.

Healthy Communities (Page 52 – including paragraphs 8.1)

8 Healthy Communities			
Number of Respondents	15	Number of Objections	9
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Support in principle the provision of on-site community, leisure, recreation & cultural facilities.
- Need to ensure that there is a common sense approach to the provision of open space in developments adjacent to the Stevenage Borough boundary.
- There is no consideration of the overall needs of the community, no identification of the gaps in provision and no specific proposals.
- Sports and recreation facilities in Baldock are inadequate.
- The policy fails to refer to the role of walking and cycling in promoting healthy living and well being.

Policy HC1 – Healthy communities (Page 52 – paragraphs 8.2 to 8.4)

Policy HC1: Healthy communities			
Number of Respondents	26	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	15	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- Sports facilities should be incorporated into Policy HC1.
- No provision is made for the allocation of any sites to meet any identified community sports needs.
- The policy relating to the loss of sports facilities does not make provision for development in line with para 74 of the NPPF.
- Policy is supported as it seeks to protect and enhance existing facilities as well as encouraging new ones.
- Part 4 of the policy should be amended to align this with para 61 of the NPPF.
- Planning conditions and obligations should not impose unnecessary delays to prevent planned development – as stated in paras 204 – 206 in the NPPF.
- Consideration should be given to the future provision of community spaces within Hitchin.
- Health improvement should be a key objective of Policy HC1.

Policy HC2 – Green Space (Pages 53 and 55 – paragraphs 8.5 to 8.10)

Policy HC2: Green Space			
Number of Respondents	24	Number of Objections	4
Number of General Comments	17	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Policy is too onerous.
- The Policy's wording also implies that provision must be 'in' all developments.
- The proposals for LG1 and LG3 will have a detrimental effect on the character, extent and structure of the green space pattern for existing residents.
- No reference has been made to the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt).
- Further clarity is needed regarding the relevance of this 0.20 hectare figure.

Natural Environment (Page 56 – including paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2)

9 Natural Environment			
Number of Respondents	19	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- There is no relevance with this policy and new development proposed on Green Belt land.
- This section needs to be centred on a strategic policy to protect the natural environment and biodiversity. It needs to emphasise the importance of, and protect and enhance, the countryside as a habitat for wildlife and biodiversity.
- The policy should also refer to sites of geological interest.

Policy NE1 - Landscape and Environmental Protection (Pages 56 and 57 – paragraphs 9.3 to 9.9)

Policy NE1: Landscape and Environmental Protection			
Number of Respondents	19	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	13	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Policy wording should be amended.
- Policy concentrates on issues that arise when new development is proposed rather than providing an overall strategy for protection and improvement against which development can be assessed.
- Insufficient emphasis placed on Landscape Character Areas.
- Insufficient work done to assess impact of development proposals on surface water run-off, localised flood risk, water quality, air pollution, ecology and water flows.

Policy NE2 - Green Infrastructure (Pages 57 and 58 – paragraphs 9.10 to 9.18)

Policy NE2: Green Infrastructure			
Number of Respondents	22	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	16	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Supporting text should recognise role of agriculture in supporting management of GI.
- Policy needs to be more specific.
- No mention of 'natural greenspace' or ANGSt

Policy NE3 - Biodiversity (Pages 58 and 59 – paragraphs 9.19 to 9.22)

Policy NE3: Biodiversity			
Number of Respondents	18	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Policy needs to be reworded.
- Policy does not conform to paragraph 113 of NPPF.
- Clarity needed as to Local Wildlife Sites being managed.
- The policy lacks specific policy statements that promote biodiversity.

Policy NE4 - Renewable energy development (Pages 59 and 60 – paragraphs 9.23 to 9.25)

Policy NE4: Renewable energy development			
Number of Respondents	11	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Renewable energy proposals that have a detrimental impact on the countryside (such as wind and solar farms) should be resisted, despite the energy benefits.
- The policy needs clarification.
- There should be reference to environmental, archaeological and heritage assets.
- The policy should be strengthened to encourage the building of integrated renewables, not just standalone installations.

Policy NE5 - Delivering sustainable water supply (Pages 60 and 61 – paragraphs 9.26 to 9.30)

Policy NE5: Delivering sustainable water supply			
Number of Respondents	15	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Policy should be strengthened with reference to the NPPF.
- No development should reduce the water table.
- Renewable energy plants utilising waste should be encouraged.
- There is an opportunity to emphasise that SuDS should deliver multiple benefits for biodiversity and amenity.
- Support the aims of the policy in seeking to reduce and manage water consumption.
- The policy does not state how water be sustainably sourced.

Policy NE6 - Reducing Flood Risk (Pages 61 to 63 – paragraphs 9.31 to 9.37)

Policy NE6: Reducing Flood Risk			
Number of Respondents	20	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	15	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Policy wording should be amended.
- The policy is unnecessarily onerous and not justified.
- The policy unnecessarily duplicates the NPPF.
- Policy NE6 relates to flooding and the supporting text makes reference to sewer flooding. However, it is considered that the wording of the policy could be adjusted to make it clear that it relates to all forms of flooding including sewer flooding.

Policy NE7 - Water quality and environment (Pages 63 and 64 – including paragraphs 9.38 to 9.41)

Policy NE7: Water quality and environment			
Number of Respondents	8	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- The policy unnecessarily duplicates the NPPF.
- General support.

Policy NE8 - Water Framework Directive and wastewater infrastructure (Pages 64 and 65 – including paragraphs 9.42 to 9.49)

Policy NE8: Water Framework Directive and wastewater infrastructure			
Number of Respondents	12	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- The policy unnecessarily duplicates the NPPF.
- The policy does not fully reflect 9.49 and should be amended to do so. Also, the policy should apply to all developments, not merely the larger sites.
- The policy is welcomed.
- Policy only suggests a drainage strategy for large sites, but all sites will require connection to foul sewer network which may include improvements.

- No definition of “large” sites.

Policy NE9 - Contaminated land (Pages 65 and 66 – including paragraphs 9.50 to 9.54)

Policy NE9: Contaminated land			
Number of Respondents	8	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- All development proposals must be accompanied by an assessment by a suitably qualified person on the potential or actual impact of land contamination on surrounding receptors, otherwise the proposal will be refused.
- Contaminated land should be brought back into use.

Historic Environment (Page 67 – including paragraphs 10.1 to 10.4)

10. Historic Environment			
Number of Respondents	16	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	9	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Chapter 10 is unclear, confusing and not compliant with the NPPF and guidance.
- The policy should be amended.
- This chapter is very thin.

Policy HE1 - Heritage Strategy (Pages 67 to 70 – including paragraphs 10.5 to 10.14)

Policy HE1: Heritage Strategy			
Number of Respondents	18	Number of Objections	4
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The policy should be amended.
- The heritage strategy must be enforced.
- The Council should do more to protect the principles and original plans of the Garden City.
- Recognition of Baldock's heritage should be more prominent.
- The chapter fails to provide a clear and concise strategy for conserving and enhancing the historic environment in North Hertfordshire.
- The criteria for assessing proposals to demolish non-listed buildings are extremely unclear.

Infrastructure & Delivery (Pages 71 to 74 – including paragraphs 11.1 to 11.17)

11 Infrastructure & Delivery			
Number of Respondents	31	Number of Objections	14
Number of General Comments	16	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The lack of capacity on the A1(M) is a key constraint.
- The plan acknowledges that the A1(M) is at capacity but doesn't acknowledge that the local road network/rail infrastructure is at capacity.
- Further work to be done on infrastructure.

Policy ID1 - Infrastructure requirements and developer contributions (Pages 74 to 76 – including paragraphs 11.18 to 11.26)

Policy ID1: Infrastructure requirements and developer contributions			
Number of Respondents	13	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Generally supported.
- The potential for developer contributions to be applied to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment should be referred to in the policy and supporting text, as part of a positive strategy for conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
- The policy must make it very clear that development proposals will need to include provision of additional infrastructure resulting from that development.
- Viability calculations should be reassessed at the completion of a scheme as well as at planning.

Policy ID2 – Masterplans (Pages 76 and 77 – including paragraphs 11.27)

Policy ID2: Masterplans			
Number of Respondents	15	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency would like to see an amendment to the policy. The Environment Agency would like to see a further bullet point added at the end of policy ID2, such as 'the protection and enhancement of the wider environment, dealing with land affected by contamination and the protection of controlled waters'.

- Much of the work identified as being delegated to masterplans needs to be addressed ahead of the local plan being finalised.

Communities Part I: Development for North Hertfordshire's own needs (Page 78 – including paragraphs 12.1 to 12.2)

12 Communities Part I: Development for North Hertfordshire's own needs			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Stevenage Borough Council notes that in the event that Stevenage is unable to accommodate its own development needs, they ask that North Hertfordshire properly consider the potential ability of all relevant sites and areas in this section of the plan to assist, not just those on the edge of the town.
- Historic England note that with a number of preferred sites it is difficult to ascertain the scale of possible impact on heritage assets given the vagueness of the proposed use and the lack of information on how each site might be developed.

Ashwell (Pages 80 and 81 – including paragraphs 12.3 to 12.7)

Ashwell			
Number of Respondents	36	Number of Objections	32
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Ashwell is a small community. Development would change the character of the village.
- There has been little or no improvement to the infrastructure in spite of new development.
- There are problems with water supply, sewage capacity, electricity supply and road capacity.
- The village lacks a comprehensive public transport system.
- The village school has no capacity.
- The post office is due to close.

Where did the representations come from?

- 86% of the representations were from Ashwell residents.

AS1 Land west of Claybush Road

AS1 Land west of Claybush Road			
Number of Respondents	144	Number of Objections	135
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Planning permission has been refused on four previous occasions.
- Development of the site conflicts with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
- The boundary of the site should exclude the water company land on Claybush Road.
- There is concern over loss of prime agricultural land.
- There are access issues on the site.
- The distance from the village means that more people would use their cars for short journeys.
- Natural England note the site is in close proximity to Ashwell Springs SSSI.
- Historic England note there may be an impact on scheduled monument(s).
- Hertfordshire County Council note there may be potential for bats and lizards.

Where did the representations come from?

- 92% of the representations were from Ashwell residents.

Baldock (Pages 82 to 84 – including paragraphs 12.8 to 12.20)

Baldock			
Number of Respondents	413	Number of Objections	380
Number of General Comments	32	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- There is concern regarding the scale of development proposed for Baldock.
- There is a lack of infrastructure to accommodate development, particularly issues of traffic, schools, health services and water supplies.

Where did the representations come from?

- 61.5% of the representations were from Baldock residents.
- Another sizable amount (20.6%) were from Bygrave.
- The rest were spread evenly throughout the District.

BA1 Blackhorse Farm (land north of Baldock) (mostly in Bygrave parish)

BA1 Blackhorse Farm (land north of Baldock) (mostly in Bygrave parish)			
Number of Respondents	526	Number of Objections	482
Number of General Comments	39	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- The proposed removal of Green Belt is contrary to the NPPF and other government guidance.
- The development is separated from the employment sites by the railway.
- Development would involve the loss of the safe cycle route along Bygrave Road which is heavily used.
- Historic England has concerns regarding the site because of its size and potential impact on the historic character of Baldock.
- The Environment Agency has indicated a significant surface water flood risk in the Laymore Farm, Freeland Farm and Half Way Farm area.

Where did the representations come from?

- The majority of the respondents (71%) were based in Baldock.
- The second largest number of representations came from Bygrave (10.1%)
- The rest were spread throughout the District.

BA2 Land west of Clothall Road (in Clothall parish)

BA2 Land west of Clothall Road (in Clothall parish)			
Number of Respondents	60	Number of Objections	42
Number of General Comments	9	Number of Supports	9

Summary of comments

- Development will result in the loss of green space.
- Historic England notes that the site borders a large scheduled ancient monument.
- The proposals will increase traffic, particularly at the already congested junction between Whitehorse Street and Hitchin Street. The proposals will increase traffic on South Road.

Where did the representations come from?

- 73% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA3 Land south of Clothall Common (in Clothall parish)

BA3 Land south of Clothall Common (in Clothall parish)			
Number of Respondents	67	Number of Objections	49
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	7

Summary of comments

- The scale of development is disproportionate to the size of Baldock.
- The site is quite remote from the station which will lead to an increase in car usage.
- There will be an increase in traffic at the congested junction between Whitehorse Street and Hitchin Street. The proposals will increase traffic on South Road and Clothall Road.
- Historic England notes that the site borders a large scheduled ancient monument.

Where did the representations come from?

- 78.7% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA4 Land east of Clothall Common (part in Clothall parish)

BA4 Land east of Clothall Common (part in Clothall parish)			
Number of Respondents	46	Number of Objections	31
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	7

Summary of comments

- The development will result in a loss of green space.
- The proposals will increase traffic at the already congested junction between Whitehorse Street and Hitchin Street. The proposals will increase traffic on South Road.

- The Environment Agency notes that the site is in Flood Zone One.

Where did the representations come from?

- 71.4% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA5 Land off Yeomanry Drive

BA5 Land off Yeomanry Drive			
Number of Respondents	36	Number of Objections	24
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- Development will increase traffic on Clothall Road and South Street.
- Historic England notes that the site borders a large scheduled ancient monument.

Where did the representations come from?

- 77% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA6 Land at Icknield Way

BA6 Land at Icknield Way			
Number of Respondents	22	Number of Objections	10
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency notes a significant surface water flood risk.
- There is a need to address traffic problems along the Icknield Way which serves the site.

Where did the representations come from?

- 53% of the respondents were from Baldock, with the next largest group of respondents (10%) drawn from respondents with a Luton address.

BA7 Land rear of Clare Crescent

BA7 Land rear of Clare Crescent			
Number of Respondents	26	Number of Objections	14
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- The land at BA7 has been allotments since the 1930s.
- The site is too small to accommodate affordable housing.
- Lack of vehicular access.

Where did the representations come from?

- 59% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA8 Works, Station Road

BA8 Works, Station Road			
Number of Respondents	22	Number of Objections	10
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- Development will make traffic worse.
- There is significant surface water risk to access (Station Road).

Where did the representations come from?

- 53% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA9 Adjoining Raban Court

BA9 Adjoining Raban Court			
Number of Respondents	21	Number of Objections	9
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency notes a flood risk to access (Royston Road).
- There should be site specific criteria to guide development and protect the setting of Raban Court.

Where did the representations come from?

- 56% of the representations were from Baldock residents.

BA10 Royston Road

BA10 Royston Road			
Number of Respondents	9	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Allocation is unnecessary as there is an oversupply of employment sites in the District.
- Expansion of employment uses on the site will contribute to traffic delays in Baldock town centre.
- The Environment Agency notes that the site has significant surface water flooding particularly around Warren Farm.

- Hertfordshire County Council highways note that the site has poor non-vehicle access.

BE1 Bondor Business Centre

BE1 Bondor Business Centre			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The site is small and already partially in employment use.
- The Hertfordshire County ecological unit notes that the site is of negligible ecological value.

BE2 Royston Road

BE2 Royston Road			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

- The site is small and already partially in employment use.
- There is a concern about the impact that the development of this site might have on traffic.

BB1 Bondor Business Centre East

BB1 Bondor Business Centre East			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The site is small and already partially in employment use.
- The site is of negligible ecological sensitivity.

Barkway (Page 85 – including paragraphs 12.21 to 12.25)

Barkway			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Barkway has the potential to contribute further to North Hertfordshire's housing number.
- The settlement boundary has been too tightly defined to offer any reasonable expansion of the village.

BK1 Land west of Cambridge Road

BK1 Land west of Cambridge Road			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- A localised foul network capacity upgrade may be required to enable the development of this site.
- The site has lifetime tenant grazing rights.
- The site is located outside the settlement boundary.

BK2 Land off Windmill Close

BK2 Land off Windmill Close			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Part of the site was the subject of a Village Green application in March 2013.
- The Environment Agency has noted that the site is in Flood Zone 1.
- The site will only deliver 3 affordable homes.

Barley (Page 86 – paragraphs including 12.26 to 12.30)

Barley			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- There is confusion regarding a boundary alteration from Barley Parish Council.
- Objection to Barley not having sites allocated as Barley is one of only five villages which have all five of the facilities identified and not proposed for development.
- Barley has good facilities and should be developed.
- Any site that might come forward for Barley should carefully consider infrastructure and sustainability.

Bygrave (Page 87 – paragraphs including 12.31 to 12.35)

Bygrave			
Number of Respondents	70	Number of Objections	70
Number of General Comments	0	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- There is a threat to the vitality of Baldock Town Centre.
- There is a lack of infrastructure to accommodate any development in nearby sites.

Where did the representations come from?

- 88% of the representations were from Bygrave residents.

Caldecote (Page 88 – paragraphs 12.36 to 12.40)

Caldecote			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Clothall (Page 89 – paragraphs 12.41 to 12.45)

Clothall			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Codicote (Pages 90 and 91 – including paragraphs 12.46 to 12.54)

Codicote			
Number of Respondents	231	Number of Objections	212
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- Proposals are unsustainable due to lack of employment opportunities.
- Loss of village character.
- It will result in the removal of sites from the Green Belt without exceptional circumstances.
- There is no surgery in the village and existing surgeries in Welwyn are at capacity.

Where did the representations come from?

- 90% of the representations were from Codicote residents.

CD1 Land south of Cowards Lane

CD1 Land south of Cowards Lane			
Number of Respondents	80	Number of Objections	72
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- The Environment Agency has identified the site as being in Flood Zone 1.
- The scale of development is out of keeping with the surroundings.
- There will be access issues. Access from B656 will cause congestion.
- Cowards Lane is inadequate for development.
- The amount of parking proposed is inadequate.

Where did the representations come from?

- 87% of the representations were from Codicote residents.

CD2 Codicote Garden Centre, High Street

CD2 Codicote Garden Centre, High Street			
Number of Respondents	73	Number of Objections	64
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Access from the B656 will cause congestion.
- The site lies west of a listed church.
- The closure of the garden centre and café will result in a loss of amenity.

Where did the representations come from?

- 85% of the representations were from Codicote residents

CD3 Land north of The Close

CD3 Land north of The Close			
Number of Respondents	93	Number of Objections	87
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Previous refusal of planning permission on the site.
- Loss of Green Belt.
- It was previously determined that development would be unacceptable due to traffic concerns.

Where did the representations come from?

- 88% of the representations were from Codicote residents

CD4 Land at Pulmore Water, St Albans Road

CD4 Land at Pulmore Water, St Albans Road			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- Development would increase traffic on St. Albans Road.
- The Environment Agency has noted that the site is adjacent to an operational chalk quarry.
- Further proposals about the proposed drainage strategy will need to be provided.

Graveley (Page 92 – paragraphs 12.55 to 12.61)

Graveley			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Development will lead to Graveley merging with Stevenage and losing its identity.
- The heritage of Graveley will be under threat.
- The housing number allocated for Graveley is too low compared to other similar settlements.
- Graveley does not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate development.

Where did the representations come from?

- 33% of the representations were from Graveley residents.

GR1 Land at Milksey Lane

GR1 Land at Milksey Lane			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Environment Agency notes the site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.
- The site lies partly within Graveley Conservation Area.

Great Ashby & North East Stevenage (Pages 93 and 94 – including paragraphs 12.62 to 12.66)

Great Ashby & North East of Stevenage			
Number of Respondents	11	Number of Objections	6
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt status.
- Development of the proposed sites is unsustainable.
- The site is being developed primarily to serve the needs of Stevenage which has not exhausted its development sites.
- General lack of infrastructure.

Where did the representations come from?

- 44.4% of the representations were from Weston residents.
- Residents of Peterborough, Graveley, Letchworth, Hitchin and Stevenage made up the remaining 55.6% (11.1% each).

GA1 Land at Roundwood (in Graveley parish)

GA1 Land at Roundwood (in Graveley parish)			
Number of Respondents	155	Number of Objections	141
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt status.
- Access to the site.
- Impact of the proposed development on the setting of the scheduled and Grade II* listed St. Ethelreda's Church at Manor Farm.
- Development will encourage the coalescence of Graveley and Stevenage.
- The access routes are unsuitable.

Where did the representations come from?

- 70% of the representations were from Weston residents.
- 12% were from Stevenage residents.

GA2 Land off Mendip Way (in Weston Parish)

GA2 Land off Mendip Way (in Weston Parish)			
Number of Respondents	166	Number of Objections	146
Number of General Comments	18	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt status.
- The impact of development on the woodlands around the site.
- The impact of the proposed development on the setting of Grade II listed building at Tilekiln Farm.
- Access to the site is along congested roads in Great Ashby.
- Hertfordshire County Council notes that the site falls outside accessibility criteria to local bus services. Size is of sufficient critical mass to warrant local bus service provision to be included.

Where did the representations come from?

- 72% of the representations were from Weston residents.
- 12% were from Stevenage residents.

Hexton (Page 95 – including paragraphs 12.67 to 12.72)

Hexton			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The policy should mention the Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust reserve of Hexton Chalk Pits.

Hinxworth (Page 96 – including paragraphs 12.73 to 12.77)

Hinxworth			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Hitchin (Pages 97 to 102 – including paragraphs 12.78 to 12.92)

Hitchin			
Number of Respondents	38	Number of Objections	29
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- It will set a precedent for building on Green Belt land.
- Hitchin could take more housing than proposed.
- Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists should be improved.
- There are concerns that further development will have a negative impact on the town's character.
- The Council has failed to recognise that Hitchin is far more popular with commuters than Letchworth Garden City and Baldock.

Where did the representations come from?

- 77% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT1 Land at Highover Farm

HT1 Land at Highover Farm			
Number of Respondents	116	Number of Objections	98
Number of General Comments	17	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The site has a history of planning permission refusal.
- When developed, HT1 would merge Hitchin and Letchworth.
- Development will lead to an increase in traffic. It has been noted that development will place an extra burden on the already highly congested A505 junction with the Stoffold Road. The A1(M) will have access issues.
- The site is not a comfortable walking distance from Hitchin Station or the town centre.

Where did the representations come from?

- 86% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT2 Land north of Pound Farm (St Ippolyts parish)

HT2 Land north of Pound Farm (St Ippolyts parish)			
Number of Respondents	36	Number of Objections	20
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Access on the site should not be via Broadmeadow Estate.
- It will damage the character of St Ippolyts and merge the village with Hitchin.

Where did the representations come from?

- 72% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT3 Land south of Oughtonhead Way

HT3 Land south of Oughtonhead Way			
Number of Respondents	265	Number of Objections	256
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Protection of flora and fauna on the site should be taken in to consideration.
- Traffic and access issues. Oughton Head Way and Oughton Head Lane have been mentioned as having existing traffic and access issues.

Where did the representations come from?

- 90% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT4 Land off Lucas Lane

HT4 Land off Lucas Lane			
Number of Respondents	273	Number of Objections	260
Number of General Comments	9	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- Protection of flora and fauna on the site should be taken in to consideration.
- There is a covenant on the site that states it can only be used for sports purposes.
- Traffic and access issues. Oughton Head Way and Oughton Head Lane have been mentioned as having existing traffic and access issues.
- Development of this site will lead to a loss of a sports field.

Where did the representations come from?

- 91% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT5 Land at junction of Grays Lane and Lucas Lane

HT5 Land at junction of Grays Lane and Lucas Lane			
Number of Respondents	261	Number of Objections	253
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Protection of flora and fauna on the site should be taken in to consideration.
- Traffic and access issues. Oughton Head Way and Oughton Head Lane have been mentioned as having existing traffic and access issues.

- Natural England highlight the site is in close proximity to the Chilterns AONB hence an assessment must be undertaken to ensure that the allocation can be delivered without having a significant impact on the purposes of designation of the AONB.

Where did the representations come from?

- 89% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT6 Land at junction of Grays Lane and Crow Furlong

HT6 Land at junction of Grays Lane and Crow Furlong			
Number of Respondents	260	Number of Objections	252
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Traffic and access issues. Oughton Head Way and Oughton Head Lane have been mentioned as having existing traffic and access issues.
- Natural England highlight the site is in close proximity to the Chilterns AONB hence an assessment must be undertaken to ensure that the allocation can be delivered without having a significant impact on the purposes of designation of the AONB.

Where did the representations come from?

- 90% of the representations were from Hitchin residents.

HT7 John Barker Place

HT7 John Barker Place			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency note that the site has minor surface water flood risk to access (John Barker Place).
- Anglian Water has no objection to the principle of development on this site. However it is important to note that there are sewers which cross this site.

HT8 Cooks Way

HT8 Cooks Way			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency note there may be potential contamination from previous uses (works) – PRA required (outside SPZs).
- National Grid identified this site as being crossed by or within close proximity to IP/HP apparatus.

HT9 Centre for the Arts, Willian Road

HT9 Centre for the Arts, Willian Road			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Traffic issues.
- The Environment Agency note site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1

HE1 Wilbury Way

HE1 Wilbury Way			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- This site would be more suitable for residential development.

HE2 Burymead Road

HE2 Burymead Road			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

HE3 Station Approach

HE3 Station Approach			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

HE4 Land adjacent to Priory Park

HE4 Land adjacent to Priory Park			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

HB3 Burymead Road

HB3 Burymead Road			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

HB4 Land adjacent to Priory Park

HB4 Land adjacent to Priory Park			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The site is used by the community. It contains wildlife.

Holwell (Page 103 – including paragraphs 12.93 to 12.96)

Holwell			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The site is used by the community. It contains wildlife.

Ickleford (Page 104 – including paragraphs 12.97 to 12.101)

Ickleford			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	0	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- It will set a precedent for future Green Belt development.
- Threat of coalescence between Ickleford and Hitchin.
- North Hertfordshire District Council should not take housing from neighbouring authorities.

IC1 Duncots Close

IC1 Duncots Close			
Number of Respondents	13	Number of Objections	8
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Traffic and access issues. These issues would risk pedestrian safety due to inadequate footpaths.
- Environment Agency – Potential surface water flood risk/ ponding issues to eastern side of site.

Where did the representations come from?

- 67% of the representations were from Ickleford residents.

IC2 Burford Grange, Bedford Road

IC2 Burford Grange, Bedford Road			
Number of Respondents	14	Number of Objections	8
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Traffic and access issues. These issues would put risk pedestrian safety.
- The site could accommodate more housing than the allocated 48.

Where did the representations come from?

- 67% of the representations were from Ickleford residents.

Kelshall (Page 105 – including paragraphs 12.102 to 12.106)

Kelshall			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Any future development that may occur on the site should carefully consider infrastructure and sustainability.

Kimpton (Page 106 – including paragraphs 12.107 to 12.112)

Kimpton			
Number of Respondents	11	Number of Objections	6
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- Loss of character.
- The Council's infilling policy is flawed.

Where did the representations come from?

- 75% of the representations were from Kimpton residents.

KM1 Land off Hall Lane

KM1 Land off Hall Lane			
Number of Respondents	28	Number of Objections	19
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- Uncertainty regarding landowner's desire to make site available.
- Environment Agency – Site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.
- Planning permission on the site was refused before.

Where did the representations come from?

- 81% of the representations were from Kimpton residents.

KM2 Land off Lloyd Way

KM2 Land off Lloyd Way			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Traffic and access issues which puts pedestrian safety at risk.
- Environment Agency – Site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.

KM3 Land north of High Street

KM3 Land north of High Street			
Number of Respondents	8	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Historic England advise the site adjoins Kimpton Bottom Conservation Area has the potential to impact on the significance and setting of the conservation area, particularly given its position as a green and open site on the edge of built development.

King's Walden (Page 107 – including paragraphs 12.113 to 12.117)

Kings Walden			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt land.
- Threat of coalescence.
- Luton should pay for any affordable housing should it prove necessary to develop east of Luton.

KW1 Land west of The Heath, Breachwood Green

KW1 Land west of The Heath, Breachwood Green			
Number of Respondents	9	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- There will be traffic and access issues on The Heath / Heath Road. This will jeopardise the safety of pedestrians.
- There are allotments on the site which are of value to the community.

Knebworth (Pages 108 and 109 – including paragraphs 12.118 to 12.124)

Knebworth			
Number of Respondents	201	Number of Objections	184
Number of General Comments	13	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- Loss of village character.
- Lack of infrastructure in the village e.g. doctor's surgery, parking, secondary school and possibly primary schools.
- Traffic on B197.

Where did the representations come from?

- 81% of the representations were from Knebworth residents.

KB1 Land at Deards End

KB1 Land at Deards End			
Number of Respondents	139	Number of Objections	121
Number of General Comments	12	Number of Supports	6

Summary of comments

- Permission was refused in the past.
- Access issues. Traffic to Stevenage would have to use Deards End Lane which is narrow and busy.
- The Environment Agency has identified parts the site as being in Flood Zone 1.
- KB1 should include land to the rear of Redwood on Deards End Lane.

Where did the representations come from?

- 84% of the representations were from Knebworth residents.

KB2 Land off Gypsy Lane

KB2 Land off Gypsy Lane			
Number of Respondents	143	Number of Objections	125
Number of General Comments	12	Number of Supports	6

Summary of comments

- Previous refusal of permission for a school on this site.
- Access issues. Traffic would have to use narrow Gypsy Lane which a previous appeal decision concluded was inadequate.
- Traffic to Stevenage would have to use Deards End Lane.

- The junction at Gypsy Lane and Park Lane is dangerous.
- The proposed widening of the A1(M) will impact on residents of the development.
- The majority of site falls outside accessibility to rail and bus criteria.
- The site is more than 800 metres from services in the village so residents are unlikely to walk.

Where did the representations come from?

- 85% of the representations were from Knebworth residents.

Langley (Page 110 – including paragraphs 12.125 to 12.128)

Langley			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- Objection to any development in North Hertfordshire.

Letchworth Garden City (Pages 111 to 114 – including paragraphs 12.129 to 12.143)

Letchworth Garden City			
Number of Respondents	56	Number of Objections	50
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- There is a lack of infrastructure to accommodate development.
- Development poses a threat to the Garden City.
- Loss of Green Belt.
- There is no parking at the train station.
- Impact on wildlife and heritage.
- The Plan fails to recognise the differences between Hitchin, Letchworth and Baldock.
- Letchworth is too small to be viable in terms of population. It needs more development like Hitchin.

Where did the representations come from?

- 95% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG1 Land north of Letchworth

LG1 Land north of Letchworth			
Number of Respondents	289	Number of Objections	261
Number of General Comments	23	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- Traffic and access issues.
- Threat to surrounding conservation area.
- The Heritage Foundation indicates they would not be willing to release Green Belt land for development in the absence of a clear demonstration of need and no alternative sites being available.
- The Grange Estate is under threat as a valuable amenity for local residents.
- Development would threaten the heritage of the site.

Where did the representations come from?

- 86% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG2 Former George W. King site, Blackhorse Road

LG2 Former George W. King site, Blackhorse Road			
Number of Respondents	13	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Access issues due to traffic.
- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site, subject to existing leases.
- The site may be better used for industrial development as it is surrounded by factories.

Where did the representations come from?

- 75% of representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG3 Land east of Kristiansand Way and Talbot Way

LG3 Land east of Kristiansand Way and Talbot Way			
Number of Respondents	73	Number of Objections	66
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The site is better served as green space.
- The roads surrounding the site are quite narrow, and will add to the traffic problems through Norton.
- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site.
- Confusion whether allotments are considered part of the site of redevelopment.

Where did the representations come from?

- 88% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG4 Land north of former Norton School, Norton Road

LG4 Land north of former Norton School, Norton Road			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	4
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The area is already overcrowded with cars which causes parking issues.
- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site, subject to existing leases.

Where did the representations come from?

- 50% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG5 Land at Birds Hill

LG5 Land at Birds Hill			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site, subject to existing leases.
- The Environment Agency notes the site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.

LG6 Land off Radburn Way

LG6 Land off Radburn Way			
Number of Respondents	13	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The site may be of ecological and historical importance to the area. Reps make reference to trees on site.
- The site has received previous opposition from residents (the Buffer Strip).

Where did the representations come from?

- 50% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG7 Former Gates Garage, Station Road

LG7 Former Gates Garage, Station Road			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site, subject to existing leases.

LG8 Pixmore Centre, Pixmore Avenue

LG8 Pixmore Centre, Pixmore Avenue			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site, subject to existing leases.

LG9 Former Lannock School

LG9 Former Lannock School			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- This site should be retained as open space.
- Significant surface water flood risk on site.

LG10 Former playing field, Croft Lane

LG10 Former playing field, Croft Lane			
Number of Respondents	12	Number of Objections	6
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Losing this site would damage the concept of the Garden City.
- The roads surrounding the site are quite narrow. There is a parking issue due to walkers in the area.
- Sport England - Objection is made to a potential allocation on this site as it would involve the permanent loss of one of the former Norton School's detached playing fields which may offer potential to meet community playing pitch needs.

Where did the representations come from?

- 50% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.

LG11 Garden Square Shopping Centre

LG11 Garden Square Shopping Centre			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation has a freehold interest on the site, subject to existing leases.
- Anglian Water has no objection to the principle of development on this site.

LG12 Former power station, Works Road

LG12 Former power station, Works Road			
Number of Respondents	4	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1 - FRA required.

LE1 Works Road

LE1 Works Road			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – possible reptile interest adjacent to railway depending on habitat availability. County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.

LE2 Blackhorse Road

LE2 Blackhorse Road			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.
- Site LE2 should be allocated as housing.

LE3 Icknield Way

LE3 Icknield Way			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – the site is close to Norton Common wildlife site. Reptiles possible if habitats suitable adjacent to railway. County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.

LE4 Spirella

LE4 Spirella			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – the site is close to Norton Common wildlife site. County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.

LB2 Blackhorse Road North

LB2 Blackhorse Road North			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.

LB3 Icknield Way North

LB3 Icknield Way North			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – the site is close to Norton Common wildlife site. Reptiles possible if habitats suitable adjacent to railway. County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.

LB4 Ickniel Way South

LB4 Ickniel Way South			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

- Hertfordshire County Council – the site is close to Norton Common wildlife site. Reptiles possible if habitats suitable adjacent to railway. County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.
- Site LB4 should be allocated as housing.

LB5 Spirella

LB5 Spirella			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council – the site is close to Norton Common wildlife site. County deem the site to have no ecological constraint.

Lilley (Page 115 – including paragraphs 12.144 to 12.149)

Lilley			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Newnham (Page 116 – including paragraphs 12.150 to 12.155)

Newnham			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Nuthampstead (Page 117 – including paragraphs 12.156 to 12.160)

Nuthampstead			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Offley (Page 118 – including paragraphs 12.161 to 12.165)

Offley			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

OF1 Former Allotments, Luton Road

OF1 Former Allotments, Luton Road			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Natural England noted that Site OF1 is in close proximity to the Chilterns AONB.

Pirton (Page 119 – including paragraphs 12.166 to 12.170)

Pirton			
Number of Respondents	33	Number of Objections	26
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Concern over the number of houses proposed for Pirton.
- Loss of character.
- There are many objections to the boundary changes.
- The residents of Pirton feel the allocation of 142 dwellings is unfair when compared to other villages and towns within North Hertfordshire.
- The schools are at capacity.
- The scale of the development poses a threat to the tightknit community.

Where did the representations come from?

- 96% of the representations were from Pirton residents.

PT1 Land east of Priors Hill

PT1 Land east of Priors Hill			
Number of Respondents	47	Number of Objections	38
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- It will result in too many houses.
- There are sewerage issues on the site.
- There will be traffic and access issues.
- The site is close to a listed building.
- Planning permission on the site has been refused in the past.
- Development on the site would have a detrimental impact on the heritage of the site.

Where did the representations come from?

- 85% of the representations were from Pirton.

PT2 Holwell Turn, West Lane

PT2 Holwell Turn, West Lane			
Number of Respondents	47	Number of Objections	38
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Development on this site would degrade the space between Pirton and Hitchin.
- There will be traffic and access issues.

- The presence of parked cars causes obstruction to the traffic flow.

Where did the representations come from?

- 85% of the representations were from Pirton residents.

Preston (Page 120 – including paragraphs 12.171 to 12.175)

Preston			
Number of Respondents	32	Number of Objections	26
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Objection to the village boundary amendments.
- There has been a lack of dialogue between North Hertfordshire District Council and Preston Parish Council.
- There are parking issues in Preston.

Where did the representations come from?

- 86% of the representations were from Preston residents.

PR1 Land off Templars Lane

PR1 Land off Templars Lane			
Number of Respondents	54	Number of Objections	41
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Access to the site will be difficult as the surrounding roads are quite poor.
- The Wilderness Cottage is a listed building nearby the site. This needs to be protected.

Where did the representations come from?

- 80% of the representations were from Preston residents.

Radwell (Page 121 – including paragraphs 12.176 to 12.179)

Radwell			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Reed (Page 122 – including paragraphs 12.180 to 12.184)

Reed			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Royston and District Committee have requested careful consideration of the infrastructure and sustainability of development in villages south of Royston

RD1 Land at Blacksmiths Lane

RD1 Land at Blacksmiths Lane			
Number of Respondents	4	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency note that the site is in Flood Zone 1.
- The Hertfordshire ecological unit note that the site consists of rough grazing with hedgerows and dense brambles of low potential ecological interest, although reptiles may be present.

RD2 Farmyard, Brickyard Lane

RD2 Farmyard, Brickyard Lane			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Royston and District Committee have highlighted the need to consider infrastructure and the sustainability of the development on this site.
- The Hertfordshire ecological unit note that the site consists of disturbed ground, a pond and bramble patches of low ecological sensitivity other than some reptile interest.
- Historic England have noted that the site have an impact on the significance and setting of Reed Conservation Area.

Royston (Pages 123 and 124 – including paragraphs 12.185 to 12.195)

Royston			
Number of Respondents	14	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The scale of development proposed for Royston.
- Lack of infrastructure to accommodate development, particularly issues of traffic, schools, health services.
- Royston's growth importance within the Cambridge sub-region should be recognised. Royston has good road and rail access. Royston has retail and employment opportunities.

Where did the representations come from?

- 91% of the representations were from Royston residents.

RY1 Land west of Ivy Farm, Baldock Road

RY1 Land west of Ivy Farm, Baldock Road			
Number of Respondents	14	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- A football ground on the western side of the site was previously refused. The area was previously described as 'unsustainable' by the Inspector.
- There is an opportunity to retain roadside trees as a buffer with the railway.
- The town is outside of the defined town boundary.

Where did the representations come from?

- From the information available, 38% of the representations were from residents of Hertford, 25% from Royston, and the rest were from Stevenage, Peterborough and Cambridge.

RY2 Land north of Newmarket Road

RY2 Land north of Newmarket Road			
Number of Respondents	15	Number of Objections	4
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The site could take upwards of 330 dwellings.
- The site has a history of planning permission refusal.

- Development of the site may provide community benefits by way of public community open space.
- Neighbours have reported drainage issues with surface water runoff from the site and local issues at the end of Garden Walk with the highway drains unable to cope in periods of heavy rainfall.

Where did the representations come from?

- 64% of the representations were from Royston residents.

Ry3 Land off Burns Road

Ry3 Land off Burns Road			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Access issues.
- Site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.

Ry4 Land north of Lindsay Close

Ry4 Land north of Lindsay Close			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Royston Town Council deemed the site unsustainable because of sewage incapacity (Royston Sewage Treatment Works – AWS/EA).
- Access issues.

Ry5 Agricultural supplier, Garden Walk

Ry5 Agricultural supplier, Garden Walk			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Existing business currently on site.
- Some SW flood risk to access.

RY6 Royston Football Club, Garden Walk

RY6 Royston Football Club, Garden Walk			
Number of Respondents	12	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Until an appropriate alternative for the football club is found, the site is unsuitable.
- The site is best served with leisure use.
- Access and traffic issues.
- Failure to find an appropriate replacement would be contrary to policies that protect playing fields in the NPPF and Sport England's playing fields policy and would therefore not be considered to meet the tests of soundness. A detailed policy is required.
- Royston Town Football Club has an agreed option with Leach Homes to develop Garden Walk, which will come into effect when the relocation site can be secured.

Where did the representations come from?

- 43% of the representations were from Royston residents.

RY7 Anglian Business Park, Orchard Road

RY7 Anglian Business Park, Orchard Road			
Number of Respondents	8	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	6	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The site is ideally suited to provide residential development due to its location, proximity to public transport and proximity to the town centre.
- The site would be better used as employment land.
- More housing could be accommodated on the site.

RY8 Land at Lumen Road

RY8 Land at Lumen Road			
Number of Respondents	7	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- A business exists on the site. The site may also need remedial measures.
- Potential contamination from previous uses.
- Trees on site are of local value.
- A Traffic Management Review is needed for the Mill Road area. Two dance studios located down Lumen Road mean there is heavy traffic in the area.

Ry9 Land north of York Way

Ry9 Land north of York Way			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Hertfordshire County Council states that lizards need to be surveyed.
- The Environment Agency notes that site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.

RE1 Orchard Road

RE1 Orchard Road			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Rushden (Page 125 – including paragraphs 12.196 to 12.200)

Rushden			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Sandon (Page 126 – including paragraphs 12.201 to 12.205)

Sandon			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

St Ippolyts (Page 127 – including paragraphs 12.206 to 12.211)

St Ippolyts			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Concern over traffic and access issues that will be generated at Site SI1 and SI2 as a result of development.
- The schools are at capacity.
- Lack of infrastructure.
- The transport system is inadequate to deal with the increase in population.
- The health facilities are at capacity.

SI1 Land south of Waterdell Lane

SI1 Land south of Waterdell Lane			
Number of Respondents	36	Number of Objections	19
Number of General Comments	12	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- Traffic and access issues. This will also put pedestrians at risk.
- The boundary along site SI1 should not protrude beyond the building line of south-west of Waterdell Lane.
- There are allotments on one corner of the site which are currently in use.

Where did the representations come from?

- 59% of the representations were from residents of Hitchin.

SI2 Land south of Stevenage Road

SI2 Land south of Stevenage Road			
Number of Respondents	19	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	5

Summary of comments

- It might be worth proposing some of the land for self build homes.
- Previous planning permission refused on site.
- The development of this site will set the precedent for urban sprawl.

Where did the representations come from?

- Residents of St Ippolyts and Hitchin made up 66% of the representations.

St Paul's Walden (Page 128 – including paragraphs 12.212 to 12.217)

St Paul's Walden			
Number of Respondents	10	Number of Objections	8
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The public transport system is inadequate.
- The schools are at capacity.
- There are concerns over sewerage capacity.
- Loss of character.
- The health facilities are at capacity.

Where did the representations come from?

- 89% of the representations were from residents of St Paul's Walden.

SP1 Land south of High Street, Whitwell

SP1 Land south of High Street, Whitwell			
Number of Respondents	143	Number of Objections	132
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Development would be in character with the surrounding area.
- The site is outside the village boundary.
- The site is far from employment and schools.
- Traffic and access issues. There is a presumption that possible access is through a gate between a listed building, and another access area by the High Street on a bend with poor visibility.
- A similar site (WH/r2) was withdrawn as a proposed site in the previous consultation on grounds of access. There is a precedent.
- Planners have already refused off road parking for a development at the Old Baptist Chapel in the past. It was refused due to poor visibility.
- It would result in the demolition of garages.

Where did the representations come from?

- 87% of the representations were from residents of St Paul's Walden.

Stevenage North (Page 129 – including paragraphs 12.218 to 12.221)

Stevenage North			
Number of Respondents	17	Number of Objections	14
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- The loss of Green Belt, particularly for access to the countryside.
- Concerns over the impact of development on Forster Country and St Nicholas Conservation Area.
- The increase in congestion on local and strategic roads and railways in the area resulting from development in the area.
- Lack of local infrastructure in the area in particular Thames Water's concerns over waste water capacity.

Where did the representations come from?

- 47% of the representations were from Stevenage residents.

NS1 North of Stevenage (in Graveley parish)

NS1 North of Stevenage (in Graveley parish)			
Number of Respondents	124	Number of Objections	108
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Concerns over the impact of development on Forster Country and St Nicholas Conservation Area.
- Development of this site would change the character of the Hertfordshire Way from rural footpath to a suburban alleyway. Graveley BR8 would become a strip between houses and small wood. Much of Graveley FP7 would be through the urban area. This is contrary to other policies in the Preferred Options paper.
- Development would cross the tree belt at the boundary of Stevenage borough and spill over the crest of the ridge between Graveley and Chesfield, into Graveley valley, making the new expanded Stevenage visible from many miles away.
- Affordable Social Housing is likely to be lacking in a developer-led development.

Where did the representations come from?

- 45% of the representations were from Stevenage.
- 20% of the representations were from Graveley.
- 9% of the representations were from Weston.
- The rest were from areas within the district and beyond.

Therfield (Page 130 – including paragraphs 12.222 to 12.226)

Therfield			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	3	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Both sites are within a historic settlement with archaeological potential.
- Royston and District Committee have highlighted the need to consider infrastructure and sustainability needs for proposed sites in the villages south of Royston.
- Improvement needed to the A1(M) (Therfield Parish Council).

TH1 Land at Police Row

TH1 Land at Police Row			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The site is unploughed meadow land.
- Development would be highly visible and damage the character of the village.
- The Environment Agency has noted that the site is approximately 130 metres and 160 metres away from two of our groundwater observation boreholes.
- Thames Water does not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding waste water capacity in relation to this site.

TH2 Land south of Kelshall Road

TH2 Land south of Kelshall Road			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The Environment Agency has noted the possibility of contamination from the previous use.
- Historic England have noted that site TH2 has the potential to harm the significance and setting of the conservation area and the surrounding countryside, as well as the Grade II* listed Old Rectory to the west.

Wallington (Page 131 – including paragraphs 12.227 to 12.231)

Wallington			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

Weston (Page 132 – including paragraphs 12.232 to 12.238)

Weston			
Number of Respondents	11	Number of Objections	7
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Weston is a small community and development would change the character of the Village irrevocably.
- Removal of sites from the Green Belt without exceptional circumstances.
- The schools in Weston are overstretched. Weston Primary School is already under pressure from housing development in Great Ashby.
- The surgeries are overstretched.
- The leisure facilities in Weston are overstretched.

WE1 Land off Hitchin Road

WE1 Land off Hitchin Road			
Number of Respondents	87	Number of Objections	68
Number of General Comments	9	Number of Supports	10

Summary of comments

- The surrounding area could not cope with additional traffic and parking (Friars Road and the Snipe are at capacity).
- Poor access to the site due to narrow roads.
- General support. The development will support and maintain the facilities of the parish such as the shop, school, pubs, village hall etc.

Where did the representations come from?

- 88% of the representations were from Weston.

Wymondley (Page 133 – including paragraphs 12.239 to 12.245)

Wymondley			
Number of Respondents	6	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- The scale of development proposed is disproportionate to the existing village which will suffer from a loss of character.
- Loss of Green Belt is justified only in very special circumstances which do not exist in this case.
- Lack of capacity on roads through the village will be made worse by the development.
- There are no doctors in the village.
- There is a lack of capacity at Lister Hospital.

WY1 Land south of Little Wymondley

WY1 Land south of Little Wymondley			
Number of Respondents	97	Number of Objections	80
Number of General Comments	14	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Foul sewer capacity enhancement may be required.
- Environment Agency recommends flood risk assessment for development.
- Impact on listed buildings.

Where did the representations come from?

- 76% of the representations were from Wymondley.

Chapter 12 Part II: Development for wider needs of Luton housing market area

Cockernhoe & East of Luton (Pages 135 and 136 – including paragraphs 12.246 to 12.253)

12 Communities Part II Development for wider needs of Luton			
Number of Respondents	5	Number of Objections	3
Number of General Comments	2	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

North Herts must not cater for the needs of other local authorities.

Cockernhoe & East of Luton

Cockernhoe & East of Luton			
Number of Respondents	1638	Number of Objections	1622
Number of General Comments	13	Number of Supports	3

Summary of comments

- Traffic issues. The roads will become more congested.
- The health facilities are at capacity.
- The road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with any increase in traffic.
- The schools are at capacity.
- Threat of coalescence.
- There will be further pressure on the police service.

Where did the representations come from?

- 51% of the representations were from residents of Luton.
- 19% were from residents of Offley.
- 10% were from residents of King's Walden. The rest were drawn from areas within the district and beyond.

EL1 Wandon Park

EL1 Wandon Park			
Number of Respondents	21	Number of Objections	12
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- A previous petition objected to the site.
- The Environment Agency notes that the site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.

- Historic England highlighted the need to preserve archaeology and historic landscape features, including Brickiln Wood.

Where did the representations come from?

- 42% of the representations were from Luton residents.

EL2 Wandon Park extension

EL2 Wandon Park extension			
Number of Respondents	20	Number of Objections	11
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- A previous petition objected to the site.
- The Environment Agency notes that the site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.
- Historic England highlighted the need to preserve archaeology and historic landscape features, including Brickiln Wood.

Where did the representations come from?

- 33% of the representations were from residents of Luton.
- 17% from both Preston and Hertford.
- The rest were drawn from King's Walden, Peterborough, Cambridge and Offley.

EL3 Land west of Cockernhoe

EL3 Land west of Cockernhoe			
Number of Respondents	21	Number of Objections	12
Number of General Comments	7	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Environment Agency notes site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.
- The site lies within 300 metres of Putteridge Bury and in conjunction with Sites EL1 and EL2 would effectively surround the village of Cockernhoe. There are concerns about the impact on Putteridge Bury and the urbanisation of its southern boundary.

Where did the representations come from?

- 31% of the representations were from Luton residents.
- A further 30% were made up of Preston and Hertford residents.
- The rest were drawn from King's Walden, Peterborough, Cambridge, Hitchin and Offley.

Chapter 12 Part III: Reserved sites for future needs

West of the A1 (M) at Stevenage (Page 138 – including paragraphs 12.254 to 12.257)

12 Communities Part III: Reserved sites for future needs			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	0	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

West of the A1(M) at Stevenage

West of the A1(M) at Stevenage			
Number of Respondents	41	Number of Objections	26
Number of General Comments	11	Number of Supports	4

Summary of comments

- Loss of Green Belt.
- There is a threat of coalescence.
- Loss of village character.

Where did the representations come from?

- 19% of the representations were from residents of Letchworth Garden City.
- 13% were from Weston.

WS1 West of Stevenage (straddles parishes of Knebworth, Langley, St Ippolyts and Wymondley)

WS1 West of Stevenage (straddles parishes of Knebworth, Langley, St Ippolyts and Wymondley)			
Number of Respondents	8	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- There will be traffic and access issues.
- Development will result in the loss of valuable countryside.
- Historic England has previously expressed some concerns in terms of impact on the historic environment.
- Natural England note that a safeguarded land allocation is in close proximity to Knebworth Woods SSSI.
- The Environment Agency note that the site is over one hectare in Flood Zone 1.

Proposal Maps

Proposal Maps			
Number of Respondents	2	Number of Objections	1
Number of General Comments	0	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- No substantive comments received expressing concerns.

SA/SEA

SA/SEA			
Number of Respondents	3	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- It was quite difficult to understand.

Supporting Evidence

Supporting Evidence			
Number of Respondents	15	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	8	Number of Supports	2

Summary of comments

- Concerns that the transport evidence is inadequate.

New Proposed Sites

New Proposed Sites			
Number of Respondents	40	Number of Objections	5
Number of General Comments	10	Number of Supports	25

Summary of comments

- General comments promoting and objecting to new sites and the proposed allocations.

Excluded Sites

Excluded Sites			
Number of Respondents	20	Number of Objections	2
Number of General Comments	4	Number of Supports	14

Summary of comments

- General comments about reassessing sites that were previously excluded.

Omissions

Omissions			
Number of Respondents	1	Number of Objections	0
Number of General Comments	1	Number of Supports	0

Summary of comments

- Policy amendments recommended.

Priory Fields

Priory Fields			
Number of Respondents	93	Number of Objections	87
Number of General Comments	5	Number of Supports	1

Summary of comments

- Although the site was not earmarked for development in the Local Plan Preferred Options, some respondents made representations reiterating their objections to development on Priory Fields.