

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Hitchin Forum Planning Group		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Comment	<p>General comments:</p> <p>1. We found ourselves asking what difference this document will mean in practice and we felt that the Appendix B 'Design Checklist' is fundamental to the document's success or lack of it. It should be seen as a starting point for developers. We therefore feel it should not be relegated to an appendix, but should become part of a first section of the SPD, giving references in a separate column to where the issues are covered in the document itself (including the individual sections on the various settlements). There should then be clear references/links within the document indicating where further policy help can be found (including to the appendix giving website addresses etc). This approach would both give due prominence to a very useful set of criteria and help people navigate the document.</p> <p>Further, we trust that a developer will have to provide considerable background documentation to support the boxes ticked in the checklist!</p> <p>Specifically on the details within the Design Checklist itself, section 3 question 5 has a subsidiary question that should be separated as has section 8 question 1; section 9 questions 4 and 5 need rewording as they cannot be answered by a tick.</p> <p>One issue not covered in this document is the preservation of natural woodland. Woodland often contributes to the character of an area and there are also strong ecological reasons why it should be retained. Hertfordshire is one of the least wooded counties in England, and every effort must be made to ensure we retain what little remains.</p> <p>Finally, we are pleased to see this guidance being published and would be grateful to be kept informed of any further</p>	<p>The checklist is a large document and is best suited in an appendix as it doesn't particularly fit with the format of the existing document. We will endeavour to make it more visible and prominent within the main document as it will be a particularly important consideration in negotiation with developers.</p> <p>As well as being a tool for developers the checklist will be used by DC officers to tick off what has been provided and to make a judgement if sufficient information has been provided.</p> <p>Section 3 Q5 - the second part of this question (although a separate question) very much relates to the 1st part and so should remain one question as it is now.</p> <p>Section 8, Q1, the questions have been separated in line with your comments.</p> <p>Section 9 Q4 and 5 the questions have been amended to be answerable with a tick as you suggest.</p> <p>With regard to woodland the following sentence has been added to para 410 "Woodlands also influence the landscape as their physical structure, form and seasonal variety contribute greatly to the overall character and attractiveness of the North Hertfordshire rural area."</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				amendments or documentation arising from this.	
Kennedy		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Support	The Royston Society generally supports the SPD document. We trust the Council will ensure the guidelines are followed for all new developments and it is against this document which the Royston Civic Society will assess all new development proposals.	support is noted. Until the parent policies are adopted the SPD will be for guidance only
Keep		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Comment	I like the document overall, especially its emphasis on sustainability and security issues. However, I am concerned that the Ashwell guidance to "prevent the station area coalescing with the rest of Ashwell" may conflict with sustainability. I feel seamless integration of the station area with Ashwell may encourage its residents to walk or cycle to the station rather than driving.	This is a valid point. The two considerations need to be balanced. The Local Plan policy designation has sought to keep the areas separate and keep the Station Road area part of the wider countryside, but as you suggest this area of the village is closer to the station and hypothetically additional development here may encourage more people to use sustainable methods of movement. The Council's DPDs will make the decisions over which land will be developed in the future and will balance a wide variety of considerations when doing so. Both of the points taken above will be taken into account at such time. On this issue the specific bullet point has been amended to read • " Seek to protect existing open spaces that maintain the existing village character. " rather than specifically defining this area and making judgements over what is appropriate.
Royston Town Council		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Comment	Useful exercise: a. for awareness of planning policies and b. opportunity to give our comments.	Noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Woolmer Green Parish Council		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Comment	Woolmer Green Parish Councillors appreciate being asked for their views on the Planning Document. They do not wish to make a comment.	Noted.
Tait		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Support	<p>REED</p> <p>The reasons given for keeping the centre meadows open and free from development are logical and make good sense. Over the years, Reed has developed with straight roads, making a square around the centre meadows, it is important to maintain the openness of the centre meadows, with any future development on the periphery of the village, outside the centre meadows.</p>	Comments on Reed are noted.
Shire Consulting		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Comment	<p>On the matter of the SPD as a whole, we note that the Council's Local Development Framework does not yet have any adopted Development Plan Documents. It is those DPDs that will contain strategic and development management policies so it is premature for the Council to prepare SPD when there are no up-to-date planning policies on which it can elaborate. The Council should concentrate on completing the updating of its planning policies through the preparation, examination and adoption of DPDs before using its limited resources to prepare SPD that has no recent policy support.</p> <p>On more specific matters, parts of the SPD appear to be attempting to write policy. That is contrary to the Government's clear intentions that policy should be in DPDs which are subject to formal examination and SPD should not contain policy that should be examined (PPS12).</p> <p>For Example: Paragraph 251 and</p>	<p>As paragraph 16 states the SPD is for guidance only, it is not considered premature as what is detailed is not policy, merely guidance. Design briefs and SPDs can provide more detail and supplement policies and should this document need to be revised following changes to the Core Strategy policies this can be completed at a later date.</p> <p>Paragraph 251 the design principles have been amended for clarity to read • Backland development along the High Street has generally been resisted. Continuing this approach would protect the linear nature of the village, but could further contribute to polarisation of communities, and • The open areas of the village should generally be protected to maintain existing character - the existing character of a village is one consideration of a number that need to be taken into account when allocating additional land for</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>Paragraph 368 (see relevant chapter)</p> <p>Such matters should be removed from the SPD and, only if justified by robust evidence, set out in a future DPD that will be subject to the formal examination process. Furthermore, these two examples display a lack of consistency of approach with one apparently applauding the linear nature of the village (how sustainable is that?) and the other commenting that the lack of a linear form "adds to its sense of place". In both examples the document sets out to freeze the existing form of the villages. taking no account of the fact that their form is the result of continuous evolution and change. The intention in the SPD is actually the antithesis of planning.</p> <p>We believe that the Council should cease preparation of this SPD until the preparation of updated policy documents is at an advanced stage but if it intends to continue with the Draft Design SPD, the document will require careful editing to remove any matters of policy and to ensure a consistency of approach.</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Paragraph 368 has been amended to read • <i>The entrance to the village along Rushden Road is an important feature of the village that should be enhanced.</i></p> <p>As previously stated the document is for guidance only and is therefore its content is not policy.</p>
Royston and District Local History Group		Draft Design SPD February 2011	Comment	I write on behalf of the Royston & District Local History Society in respect of the above. The Society wish to support the Royston Town Council on their comments for this Consultation.	Support for Royston Town Council comments are noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Moore		1. Introduction	Comment	Overall, I would like to commend what is obviously a well considered document where clearly, a great deal of thought and effort has been made to consider a wide variety of existing uses within all village settlements. Quite rightly, as at paragraph 16, the guide has been produced by North Herts District Council to inspire, raise standards and influence the design of development to ensure (amongst other things) that it respects and compliments the existing built character and natural environment of the District.	Support is noted.
New Road Developments Ltd	Savills on behalf of New Road Development Ltd	1. Introduction	Object	<p>It is important to acknowledge that whilst we support the Councils intention to provide further guidance on design issues within the District, this SPD should only be progressed at the appropriate time we know already that the Core Strategy DPD which was being advanced by the Council has now slowed down and this is perhaps hardly surprising given the timetabling and emerging views with regards to the Regional Spatial Strategy and the proposed contents of the proposed Localism Bill.</p> <p>In this context we know that paragraph 36 of the draft SPD states that until the Core Strategy is formally adopted than the SPD will only be for guidance only rather than being used as a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. With the timetabling of the Core Strategy uncertain, we do question whether the production of the draft SPD on design is premature.</p>	Consultation on the Core Strategy and Development Policies will be taking place in the summer. As you note the SPD is for guidance only until the policies are adopted and therefore is not considered premature.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
New Road Developments Ltd	Savills on behalf of New Road Development Ltd	1. Introduction	Comment	Setting aside issues of timing, we acknowledge the importance of achieving good design and sustainable development as the core principle underlining planning. Given the variations in the way local planning authorities across the Region and indeed the Country address design matters at the detailed stage, it is inappropriate to be critical about the level of detail, although we would comment this is certainly the case of a document seeking to only address design issues at a very good level.	Comments noted.
Billing		1. Introduction	Comment	<p>Para 1.3, in relation to penultimate bullet on quality - add something about durable quality, ie design should anticipate what weather, vegetation, vandalism, misuse, disuse of some aspects etc can do over a long period, say 50 years.</p> <p>Para 24, anti penultimate bullet - add Members (ie relevant councillors) to Pre-application discussions - this is good practice in many authorities.</p> <p>Para 29, last bullet "Issue" not "Tissue" I guess.</p>	The issue of durable quality has been added to paragraph 17. Member involvement has been specifically added to the penultimate bullet of Paragraph 24. The word "Tissue" has been amended to " key issue " in the last bullet in paragraph 29
Royston Town Council		1. Introduction	Comment	<p>Urban Design: Important links are needed between different areas of the town to unite the town of Royston.</p> <p>Local Context: Agree with boundary statement.</p> <p>Purpose: There should be a procedure for the adoption of roads with a set timescale.</p> <p>Format: A checklist is needed to include legal obligations.</p> <p>Consideration of Design: Agree with statement.</p>	Comments noted. The Design SPD provides design guidance for any future development. Legal obligations and adoption of roads are part of wider planning application process.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Smith		1. Introduction	Comment	In all planning documents and relevant guidance, there should be much greater emphasis on the need to preserve farmland and woodland.	There is a presumption against development outside settlement boundaries. One of the design guidelines for the rural area is in fact - Protect the rural area of North Hertfordshire from inappropriate development. The Landscape character assessment does encourage protection of woodland and wooded areas is identified in paragraph 419 as a key component of the western side of the district. In addition the following text has been added to paragraph 410 <i>"Woodlands also influence the landscape as their physical structure, form and seasonal variety contribute greatly to the overall character and attractiveness of the North Hertfordshire rural area "</i>
R A Pilkington Esq	Savills (L & P) Limited	1. Introduction	Object	<p>The preparation of a proposed Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and design is welcomed where it would add to the appreciation of design issues within the District. Importantly, the SPD must follow on from policies within the Core Strategy and as the Council will appreciate, that document has only been partially advanced. No date or timescale to our knowledge has been given about the next stage of consultation for the Core Strategy and in such a context there must be some questions raised about the relevance of any SPD which is indirectly linked to a very embryonic Development Plan Document.</p> <p>1Paragraph 36 of the SPD states that until the Core Strategy is formally adopted then the SPD is for guidance only and should not be considered as a material</p>	Consultation on the Core Strategy and Development Policies will be taking place in the summer. As you note the SPD is for guidance only. Only once the policies are adopted will the Design SPD become policy and therefore it is not considered premature as it provides guidance for what the council will be expecting to see in the future.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>consideration. There is thus an issue as to whether the SPD is premature in terms of the current consultation exercise.</p> <p>Despite concerns about timing, we acknowledge the importance of achieving good design and sustainable development as the core principle underpinning planning. The difficulty is what level this is pitched at since Government acknowledges that there is a balance to be struck between prescriptive guidance and general strategy which adds little to design considerations.</p> <p>To this end, Sections 1-3 of the SPD provide general context of how important urban design and sustainability issues are to new development and identify key urban design principles which are rather generic rather than unspecific to North Hertfordshire. For this reason, it is difficult to comment on such matters given the broad nature of the issues referred to and the broad applicability of the guidance to any new development.</p>	
The Baldock Society		1. Introduction	Comment	<p>Purpose of the document</p> <p>The design guide should be an important document in helping to raise design standards in the District. It starts with appropriately high ambitions: 'to inspire, raise standards and influence the design of development' (para. 16). However the draft SPD fails to deliver this objective.</p> <p>It is text-heavy, devoid of drawings and other illustrations, and its written content is uninspiring. Advice is set out in very general terms, in a way that does not connect sufficiently to the intrinsic character of different places in North Herts. Indeed, the type of generic guidance that it sets</p>	<p>The design SPD is not written to be prescriptive as this is not the way to create good design. The first part of the document introduces the generic issues and then each of the four towns and 21 larger villages have their own specific guidance, which is attempting to balance a mixture of more general and locally specific guidance. The SPD encourages design to be considered from the start of any proposal, which will ensure it is considered. The work from the urban design assessments has been taken forward in the SPD, specifically the guidelines produced for each of the towns, but also the methodology used for the villages.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>out is conveyed far more effectively in a range of national guidance such as the Urban Design Compendium (EP/Housing Corp, 2000).</p> <p>The bland nature of the guidance makes it very hard to tell what it is that the Council would like to see in new development; as a result it is unlikely that the document as drafted would have much impact on development proposals.</p> <p>Relationship to other reports</p> <p>Strangely, the draft SPD fails to capitalise upon \hat{A}_i or connect adequately to \hat{A}_i the very clear analysis and proposals in the Urban Design Assessments prepared for you by Urban Initiatives and published in 2007. Those reports set out far more effectively the intrinsic character of each place and how this presents design cues.</p> <p>It would be far better for the SPD to make a clear link between those analyses and the key design principles that the Council would like to promote, rather than setting out very broad design principles in such a bland and uninspiring way. While certain paragraphs (such as 161 and 164) allude to the Urban Design Assessment, simply saying that it should be 'taken it into account' adds nothing of value.</p> <p>The checklist at the rear is useful, but again it would have been better to use an existing list that is well understood and supported by effective guidance, such as the Building for Life standards.</p> <p>Status of the SPD</p>	

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>The SPD could set out far more clearly what its status is: para. 2 makes the link to emerging DPD policies, but these are far from being adopted; para. 36 does the same, but no connection is made to the saved Local Plan policies which for the time being remain the statutory basis for planning decisions in the District.</p> <p>Resources available for design</p> <p>Our disappointment with the draft SPD raises a wider concern, which is the resource that the Council has available to engage with design matters. The weaknesses evident in the document are, we suspect, a reflection of the limited expertise available in-house to promote good design in the planning process.</p> <p>This may, to an extent, be inevitable given the small size of the District Council and the current pressure on resources. But it reinforces our point that there is not much to be gained from an SPD that adds so little to the existing guidance available, and which is so uninspiring to read.</p> <p>North Herts. has suffered from a number of poorly-designed developments in recent years, so effective policy must be supported by the means to implement it. The answer is apart from a much more focused SPD may lie in a greater sharing of services with neighbouring councils, although we recognise that even then resources will need to be prioritised.</p>	

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Hitchin Forum Planning Group		2. Policy Context	Comment	Para 32 - where possible, links to the documents should be included in this document to assist in linking upwards. Para 45 - we agree that a carefully integrated approach is needed to ensure that the historic environment is protected while climate change aspirations are met.	A footnote to the NHDC LDF has been added to para 32. Links to documents are included where appropriate. Agreement Noted
Baldock Museum and Local History Society		2. Policy Context	Comment	There should be more effort to disentangle what really helps towards this and what is simply tokenism. Inefficient wind turbines full into the second category and our countryside should not be ruined for tokenism.	Comments noted. Any specific schemes will be judged on their merits, however one of the design guidelines for the rural area is - Protect the rural area of North Hertfordshire from inappropriate development.
Royston Town Council		2. Policy Context	Support	Agree with comments.	Agreement is noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Baldock Museum and Local History Society		3. Design Standards	Comment	<p>3.1 Design Standards - Foundations of Good Design? This is all very well but many conservation areas and historic parts of towns that the outside conservation areas have and continue to be ruined by unsympathetic new development.</p> <p>3.2 Key Urban Design Principles? There is a tendency to too readily allow old industrial/business premises in towns to be redeveloped as residential. This is detrimental to the diverse character of towns and theatres to make them more dormitories. It does not fit with notions of "sustainability" as it means people in towns have to use cars to get to relocated industries/businesses out of town.</p>	<p>This Design SPD is seeking to raise standards of design, preventing unsympathetic developments. Protection of employment and changes of use are key policy considerations. Policies on these issues will be included in the development policies DPD. A number of employment sites have changed to residential often where the employment use have been vacant. Although, in sustainability terms this is not ideal, resisting the change is difficult if there isn't a need identified for the existing use.</p>
Royston Town Council		3. Design Standards	Comment	<p>Question 3.1 Substantial designs should be in keeping with area and character of area. Most points have been covered well. Good mixture of residential and retail ensures good security and affordable living for people living in the residential flats.</p>	<p>Points on mix of housing types are noted.</p>
Andrews		3. Design Standards	Comment	<p>Village of Reed. Any permitted future developments should be of a high standard.</p>	<p>Comments on Reed noted.</p>
Heath		3. Design Standards	Comment	<p>3.1 Housing design should include for more flexible space in interiors. Moveable walls would enable variations to suit a growing family and later on adaptations could permit older people to re-arrange space for changed sleeping requirements due to immobility etc.</p>	<p>Comments on flexibility are noted. Paragraphs 137 - 139 cover details on adaptability, which would support flexible interior space.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Hitchin Forum Planning Group		1. Character (sense of place and history)	Comment	<p>2. We feel the section on Density needs further clarification along the following lines: The density of a development should be the product of consideration of other design criteria, eg height of buildings, provision of open space etc; developers and owners should therefore not begin with an unrealistic assumption of a density for a particular development. The density figure reached as a result of this process should not differ by more than 10% from that of a neighbouring historic or well established area of similar size and mix of uses whose identity has been agreed with the local community. Such comparisons should be made on the basis of habitable rooms per hectare, or square metres of commercial floor space per hectare, so as to allow for a mix of types and sizes of residential and commercial space in the new development.</p> <p>By way of explanation for the above text, we have seen densities in recent developments in Hitchin beyond that ever seen previously. Some, such as the William Ransom site, which is highlighted in the draft SPD, work well in design terms. Others, such as Coopers Yard, are much less satisfactory, and had criteria such as we suggest above been in use, we suggest Coopers Yard would have been very different, and more successful in its context. For that reason, we feel the document should describe what high density means within historic town centres, even if central government have abandoned the minimum standard, and cover the issues more fully with a wider range of examples.</p> <p>Para 88 - we feel there should be some mention of the unacceptability of upvc, given the importance of windows to the appearance of new developments.</p>	<p>The overall design of the development will be influenced by the additional issues you suggest and as a result will influence the overall density of a scheme, however the particular approach to density is an issue that will be specifically determined by the Development Policies DPD rather than this Design SPD and it is not appropriate for it to be included here.</p> <p>With regard to UPVC, In some occurrences its use will be acceptable and therefore this issue is probably best dealt with on a case by case basis rather than a blanket approach preventing its use.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Billing		1. Character (sense of place and history)	Comment	Page 240, fig 7 - have you ever been to see the William Ransom development. It's dreadful and very dominating both inside and from the outside, plus the large hard surfaces. Also, it's "proximity to the railway station" is not very accurate.	Comments on William Ransom site are noted. It's location is under 1 mile from the station.
Royston Town Council		1. Character (sense of place and history)	Comment	New developments need to be in keeping with area.	Noted.
Billing		2. Continuity and Enclosure (distinguish between public/private space)	Comment	Para 72 - are we sure that Wind is the most successful? I doubt its payback makes it really viable either financially or in carbon terms (including carbon cost of mining, fabricating and transporting materials, construction energy use, transport of workers etc). I think it is also worth mentioning geothermal energy.	Because of the creation of many windfarms both on land and at sea in the last decade or so, the energy generation from wind power is probably the greatest in total generated, however to avoid confusion this comment will be deleted from the Design SPD. Geothermal energy is covered in paragraph 60 by the term ground source heat pumps however, geothermal energy has been added to the title for clarification.
Royston Town Council		2. Continuity and Enclosure (distinguish between public/private space)	Comment	Royston has its own historical design frontage for conservation areas which needs to be taken into account.	The historic frontage in Royston is noted in the design SPD, specifically paragraphs 221 -229. This is further detailed in the Royston Urban Design Assessment and Royston Conservation Area Character Statement.
Andrews		2. Continuity and Enclosure (distinguish	Comment	Reed benefits from a central open area which serves as the village cricket field and football pitch. This area is well used by walkers and dog owners. In addition there are many well signed footpaths leading to the villages of Buckland,	Comments on Reed are noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
		between public/private space)		Barkway and the town of Royston.	
Hitchin Forum Planning Group		3. Quality of the Public Realm (sense of well-being and amenity)	Comment	Para 107 - there is a tendency in new developments to plant exotics. In general, in order to support things like green corridors, planting should use native species.	Reference to native species has been added to paragraph 109.
Billing		3. Quality of the Public Realm (sense of well-being and amenity)	Comment	<p>Paras 111-113 : lighting should also be energy efficient.</p> <p>Para 118 - there is police guidance on design "Secure by Design" I think (see Architectural Liaison Officer)</p> <p>Para 120 - yes maintenance of York stone, paving slabs etc is a problem (see Hitchin High Street), but should not put developers off; it needs maintenance planning, including control over proper restoration after utilities work.</p>	Sentence added to para 113 " Lighting should also be energy efficient. " Secured by design has been used in the writing of this SPD and forms part of the list of guidance in appendix A. Comments on maintenance are noted.
Royston Town Council		3. Quality of the Public Realm (sense of well-being and amenity)	Comment	Street lights can cause light pollution so consideration should be made at point of design (no. 112). No 116 Agree.	Comments and agreement noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Andrews		3. Quality of the Public Realm (sense of well-being and amenity)	Comment	Reed benefits from a central open area which serves as the village cricket field and football pitch. This area is well used by walkers and dog owners. In addition there are many well signed footpaths leading to the villages of Buckland, Barkway and the town of Royston.	Comments on Reed are noted.
Hitchin Forum Planning Group		4. Ease of movement (connectivity and permeability)	Support	Paras 126/127 - we strongly support favouring routes for walking and cycling. We trust the Highway Authority as well as developers will take note of this so that we see more cycleways implemented in Hitchin.	The Highway Authority has been consulted as part of the consultation. Comments noted.
Codicote Parish Council		4. Ease of movement (connectivity and permeability)	Comment	It is good to see mentioned in this document 125 "Streets designed for places and for people as well as for vehicles".	Noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Billing		4. Ease of movement (connectivity and permeability)	Comment	<p>Para 121 & 125 - separating pedestrians and vehicles should not become the rule, as there is now considerable experience (particularly abroad) of safe "shared space". It is about to be tried in the Hitchin Urban Transport Plan in the town centre.</p> <p>Para 123 - there should be a presumption against "gated developments", ie where you need a code or the name of someone's entry phone to be able to get into a site, still less to walk through it (permeability) - there are other ways of providing security; Johnson Place and Sanders Place in Hitchin are bad examples, the William Ransom site is a good one.</p> <p>Para 128 - there needs to be more on design aspects of various traffic calming methods (subject as you say to Herts Highways agreement), for example the wide use of humps is not popular with the public (either residents or drivers), so we should encourage other methods such as narrowing and build-outs.</p> <p>Para 130 - parking also slows traffic</p> <p>Para 134 - can we be more directive on the need for Travel Plans?</p>	<p>Paragraph 121 refers to pedestrian and vehicles being "appropriately separated" as in some cases shared space is possible without causing danger. Gated developments are specifically referenced in the Council's development policies DPD and where they hinder pedestrian movement and integration with surrounding communities proposals will be refused. This paragraph 128 is showing how the design of a development can influence highway safety, rather than specific traffic calming features - these are the responsibility of Highways as they are within highway land.</p> <p>"Slowing vehicles down" has been added to the end of para 130</p> <p>Further detail has been added to para 134 regarding travel plans.</p>
Royston Town Council		4. Ease of movement (connectivity and permeability)	Comment	<p>If the bus services were more frequent and accessible people would use them more. The bus services would then be a sustainable mode of transport along with cycling and walking.</p>	<p>Unfortunately bus services are out of the control of the design SPD, although it is noted that a greater number of services would improve sustainable patterns of movement.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Andrews		4. Ease of movement (connectivity and permeability)	Comment	There are bus services through Reed and a Junior infants school in the village.	These details have been added to the village profile.
Jones		4. Ease of movement (connectivity and permeability)	Comment	<p>Hitchin could be so much better in supporting cycling. It needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more cycle routes, - protect the ones it does have - more cycle parking in the town centre in prominent places <p>As an example of the second point is St Michael's Road cycle route which needs to be changed from advisory. Cars now park over it near the junction with the roundabout on the A505. This means cyclists must overtake near the centre of the road with cars overtaking into oncoming traffic. It doesn't feel safe and I now don't use it. If this comment isn't relevant to this consultation please advise who I ought to speak to in the Council about this.</p>	Comments on improving cycling in Hitchin are noted
Royston Town Council		5. Legibility (ease of understanding)	Support	Agree.	Noted.
Andrews		5. Legibility (ease of understanding)	Comment	The distinctive landmark is the R.A.F G Guidance Radio mast located between Reed and Buckland.	Comment noted
Hitchin Forum Planning		6. Adaptability (ease of	Support	Para 138 - we strongly support the principle of re-use rather than demolition and new build.	Noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Group		change)			
Royston Town Council		6. Adaptability (ease of change)	Support	Agree should try to reuse and adapt building and materials. Standards to be maintained through Planning commitments/comments.	Noted.
Codicote Parish Council		7. Diversity (ease of choice)	Comment	It is good to see mentioned in this document 147 "Off street parking. Inclusion of space for off street parking".	Noted.
Royston Town Council		7. Diversity (ease of choice)	Comment	Good for security and affordability. Need to be cautious on diversity as one can have an effect on another.	Noted.
Royston Town Council		8. Quality of Private Space (usability)	Comment	Garages should be big enough to take a car! There should be adequate parking spaces for number of occupants in property.	Parking is an important consideration in design. Parking standards will be specifically detailed in the Parking SPD
Royston Town Council		9. Sustainability (reducing carbon and increasing efficiency)	Support	Agree where reasonably possible without misuse of natural resources. Innovated ideas should be encourages to promote reuse of resources.	Agreement noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Baldock Museum and Local History Society		4.1 Baldock	Comment	Failure to properly follow (as per 3.1) sensitive development have resulted in shrinkage of Conservation Area. Older parts of the town lying outside that area have been ruined in places by inappropriate blocks of flats and there is general overcrowding of houses. There is no proper, regular oversight of conservation area to ensure inappropriate shop frontages etc are checked, nor are owners of listed buildings in land repair attended to.	Conservation officers are generally consulted on applications that fall within the conservation area and certainly those that involve a listed building. This document will improve the quality of design ensuring that a development contributes to its surroundings and takes into account existing character from the start of the process, seeking to reduce inappropriate development which could cause harm to conservation areas and the historic built environment.
Hitchin Forum Planning Group		4.2 Hitchin	Comment	<p>Paras 174/188 - 'Market Square' should be replaced with 'Market Place'.</p> <p>Para 175 - should the list of studies include site-specific planning briefs such as those for Paynes Park and the Churchgate area?</p> <p>Para 176 - it is important to note that the attractiveness of streets and spaces created by the continuous frontages in Hitchin's historic core is also to do with the mix of styles and ages of the buildings which breaks up the continuity of those frontages.</p> <p>Para 181 - we are pleased to see reference to existing pedestrian links to the town centre protected and enhanced. We would also like to see a reference here that where possible new ones should be developed.</p> <p>Para 182 - we note that the first sentence is incomplete in the draft text and as indicated by email from Helen Leitch, will read as follows: The scale and typology of new buildings should be dictated by the scale and typology of historic buildings.</p> <p>Further, we are pleased to see mention of new architecture</p>	<p>Market Square changed to "Market Place".</p> <p>Churchgate and Paynes Park Development Briefs have been added to the list of relevant documents in paragraph 175.</p> <p>An additional phrase has been added to the end of paragraph 176 "which include a mix of styles and ages of buildings."</p> <p>With regard to pedestrian links the phrase "And increased where possible" has been added to para 181.</p> <p>Para 182 - comments noted and appropriate changes made.</p> <p>Para 183 - we would not want to restrict variation in roof heights to maintain interest.</p> <p>The particular approach to density is an issue that will be specifically determined by the Development Policies DPD rather than this Design SPD and it is not appropriate for it to be included here.</p> <p>Support for other paragraphs noted.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>complementing rather than copying or competing with historic styles.</p> <p>Para 183 - we are pleased to see the references to building heights and varied roofscapes. We would also like to see reference to buildings not breaking the natural skyline; this is particularly important in a hilly area such as Hitchin.</p> <p>Para 184 - 'high densities' should be further refined/defined (as indicated in our 'General Comments 2' above) even in the town centre; indeed, particularly in the town centre!</p> <p>Para 185 - we strongly support the statement about the importance of the setting and views of St Mary's Church and that they should be enhanced.</p> <p>Para 187 - we strongly support this.</p> <p>Para 188 - we strongly support the statement that the River Hiz is an important element in the character of the town centre and that its potential for a riverside walk should be fulfilled. The River Hiz Development Guidelines date from 1995, and after all these years, we hope the Council will see this as a priority.</p>	
Baldock Museum and Local History Society		4.2 Hitchin	Comment	The proposals for the developments on the Market Place and Churchgate hardly fit the statements here. Judging by what I see in the local papers , public opinion has a better idea of what is best for Hitchin.	Comments noted
Billing		4.2 Hitchin	Comment	Para 175 - what is the "Urban Design Assessment for Hitchin"? Also I think you should add to the list the Churchgate Planning Brief and the Paynes Park Planning Brief.	Churchgate and Paynes Park Development Briefs have been added to the list of documents in para 175

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Ippollitts Local History Group		4.2 Hitchin	Support	Hitchin page 24 and 25 agree with this section.	Agreement is noted.
Kennedy		4.4 Royston	Comment	We suggest that on Page 30, paragraph 224 is re-written to remove any ambiguity. The paragraph should read: 224. The views of the Grade 1 Listed St. John's Church should be protected and where possible enhanced.	Sentence amended to reflect your comments - <i>The views of the Grade 1 Listed St. John's Church should be protected and where possible enhanced.</i>
Royston Town Council		4.4 Royston	Comment	There should be better ways of accessing Royston from the A505 particularly the Burn's Road area of the town.	Comments on access to Royston noted. This is possibly an issue to raise in the Royston Urban Transport Plan.
Royston Town Council		5. Local Design Principles - Villages	Comment	In general it is strongly felt that villages should be allowed to maintain their individuality and boundaries.	Comments noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Moore		6. Local Design Principles - Rural Area	Comment	Paragraph 422. All three of these specified guidelines are exactly what is needed to protect the open rural countryside; also, even though the Consultation Draft doesn't make it abundantly clear, I assume that all the coloured areas of the village maps Appendix D are still proposed to be Inset from the Green Belt or the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt in order to fulfil future Core Policy Objectives and previous Preferred Options of the original Core Strategy first set out during 2006.	Comments on the rural area guidelines are noted. The coloured areas of the maps are merely to show the typology of design classification. They have no policy weight. Settlement and green belt boundaries will not be amended or impacted by these classifications.
Royston Town Council		6. Local Design Principles - Rural Area	Comment	Farmland and greenbelt land needs to be maintained and kept as a distinctive area.	Comments noted.
St Ippolyts Parish Council		6. Local Design Principles - Rural Area	Support	Q6 Design Principles Â¿ Rural Areas. My council agrees with the Design Principles for Rural areas.	Agreement noted.
Andrews		6. Local Design Principles - Rural Area		Any development permitted should reflect design and materials compatible with existing properties.	Comments noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Barkway Parish Council		6. Local Design Principles - Rural Area	Comment	<p>We refer to comments about Barkway only.</p> <p>Para 244 There is only 1 shop in the North end of the village, a soft furnishing/upholstery business.</p> <p>Para 251 The linear structure of the village, with 'modern' development and social housing being restricted to the Northern end of the village, (Royston Road, Windmill Close, Periwinkle Close) has had the effect of polarising the village , into the 'High Street' and 'The Estate'. It has created a polarised community which planners should bear in mind when considering any further development in Barkway. Taking into context of Paragraph 247, it is our fear that any future development on the Northern end of Barkway would exacerbate this whilst further extending the linear structure, a structure which in itself creates many problems within the village. Any extension of the village on the Northern Boundary, risks destroying the character of the village, by creating properties on the slopes that approach Barkway, which would destroy the hidden character of the existing properties and would cut into the prime agricultural land and historic estates on this end of the village Whilst backland development of the Land to East and West of the High Street is neither desirable, we do feel, that development at the Southern end of the village should be considered, if any development is to be considered at all. Land to the west of London Road, could be used, would not cause any undesirable, elongation of the village, would offer good access to the B1368, and could be sympathetic to the nature of the character of the village, and help to reverse the polarisation that exists.</p>	<p>Paragraph 244 has been amended to reflect the presence of the upholstery business. Recognition of polarisation issue has been included in paragraph 243.</p> <p>The Councils development Plan Documents will determine appropriate land for development, and which direction, if any will be appropriate for development, however the issue of polarisation has been identified as an issue in the design principles, which now reads • Backland development along the High Street has generally been resisted. Continuing this approach would protect the linear nature of the village, however could further contribute to polarisation of communities.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Ippollitts Local History Group		6. Local Design Principles - Rural Area	Support	Guidelines for the Rural Area pages 62 and 63 agree with the guidelines.	Support for rural guidelines in noted.
Codicote Parish Council		7.1 Appendix A: Relevant Guidance	Comment	In Design Principles page 68, there is mention of Parish Plans in villages, can you please add Codicote's Parish Plan.	Codicote Parish Plan has been added to the list
Royston Town Council		7.1 Appendix A: Relevant Guidance	Comment	The writing is too small and the website addresses are not distinguishable but they would be useful if clearer.	The formatting has been clarified to aid with viewing the weblinks.
Royston Town Council		7.2 Appendix B: Design Checklist	Comment	Adoption of roads should be included as part of policy.	Developers should be encouraged to liaise with the Highway Authority as early as possible regarding adoption of roads.
Royston Town Council		7.3 Appendix C: Glossary and List of Acronyms	Comment	User friendly and useful information.	Comments noted.
Ashwell Parish Council		5.1 Ashwell	Comment	<p>Paragraph 231. Deleted Taylor's replaced with Taylors'</p> <p>Paragraph 232. Added - Colborn Close, John Sales Close after Bacon's Yard.</p> <p>Paragraph 233. Added - since prehistoric times after practices.</p> <p>Paragraph 234. Added - A number of distinct areas within Ashwell can be identified such as West End, Station Road, Angell's Meadow and Woodforde Close.</p> <p>Paragraph 235. Bullet point 3 changed Mead to Meadow.</p> <p>Paragraph 241. (Why just Station Road? see last point below)</p> <p>added 2 bullet points</p> <p>Â¿ The density of buildings to reduce as towards the edge of the village.</p> <p>Â¿ The character of the district areas within the village is to</p>	<p>Para 231 changes made as suggested.</p> <p>Para 232 additions made as suggested.</p> <p>Para 233 additions made as suggested.</p> <p>Para 234 addition made as suggested.</p> <p>Para 235 changes made as suggested.</p> <p>Para 241 last bullet has been clarified to read "Seek to protect open spaces maintaining the existing village character."</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				be maintained.	
Barkway Parish Council		5.2 Barkway	Comment	We found may irregularities with the Map of Barkway , a scan of our observations is attached, which we hope if legible, However if not we are happy to meet to go through these with you.	Comments on the map of Barkway are noted. The map has been amended in line with your comments - 1. The pub to the south of the village has been included in the assessment. 2. The land around the school has been clarified, taking into account private ownership and employment uses. 3. The garage along Royston Road has been changed to employment. 4. New developments on Royston Road are both the same classification. 5. the sports field boundary has been amended. 6. Farm building to east of village changed to residential classification.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Shire Consulting		5.2 Barkway	Comment	Paragraph 251 on Design Principles for Barkway states that "Backland development along the High Street has generally been resisted, this approach should be continued to protect the linear nature of the village". It also states that "The open areas to the west of the High Street should be protected". These are policy, not design, matters and if the Council wishes to take this approach they should be based on robust evidence, set out in a DPD and subject to formal examination to test their soundness.	As previously stated the document is for guidance only and therefore its content is not policy, however the bullets have been amended to be less definitive i.e. • Backland development along the High Street has generally been resisted. Continuing this approach would protect the linear nature of the village, but could further contribute to polarisation of communities • The open areas of the village should generally be protected to maintain existing character
Heath		5.4 Breachwood Green	Comment	Retain the rural character of the village: it is a village of open style character not closed clustered. Most dwellings retain a view of the open countryside. Reference P263: there are 6 Listed farmhouses dating back to Medieval times - there would appear to be only one relating to the 17th and 18th C category. Along The Heath there is a row of flint cottages - there is an abundance of flint in the area and should be included in designs. It would add to the appearance and amenities to have a village green but the "green open space behind the Chapel" is the recreation ground for sports and is not suitably placed to be a village green.	Comments noted. Para 263 amended. No changes to the character area map. Some character zones may include small areas of another character type which are not large enough to be a character area on their own. The maps do not show land use but the character of an area which may be defined by the types of buildings present.
Codicote Parish Council		5.5 Codicote	Comment	Codicote Parish Council would like to see reference made to Codicote's new Streetscape Project which was identified in the Codicote Parish Plan and the Streetscene consultation day which is developing.	Reference made in Appendix A to Codicote Parish Plan.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Codicote Parish Council		5.5 Codicote	Comment	<p>On page 38 please amend as follows:- Built Form and Layout 274 at end of paragraph please add "and Newtown".</p> <p>Sense of Place 277 after garden plants add "and wildflowers" alongside the road.</p> <p>Design Principles 278 please add:- a. Resist further gated developments b. Resist infill developments in gardens c. Enhance the public realm by streetscape improvements d. Greenbelt retained</p>	<p>Para 274 amended as suggested. Para 277 amended as suggested. Para 278 point c added. Points a and b are in policies in the LDF and point d is Government policy.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Graveley Parish Council - Clerk		5.6 Graveley	Support	<p>We agree with the principle that all new development should ENHANCE the existing character and local distinctiveness of the local historic environment.</p> <p>Any future development in Graveley should generally be within the village central core and also be within the Conservation Area. The Parish Council however would be supportive of some limited development on the Northern side of the village, for example on part of the garden of Graveley House, along with additional play space provision there which the village is sorely lacking.</p> <p>Sites providing 3 or more dwellings should incorporate differing designs to enhance the street scene and 'anywhere' standard house designs should be avoided. To avoid coalescence no further building at all should be considered Southwards of the existing buildings as the village is already too close to Stevenage and J8 of the A1M. We agree with the suggested Graveley Design Principles (ref 289) which are :</p> <p>New development should be integrated into the existing development.</p> <p>Any development fronting the High Street should respect the historic character of the existing buildings and building line to maintain the important vista but would add a request for Village Gates/Gateway to enhance the village identity.</p> <p>Furthermore, an existing feature of the road entrances to the village area of well spaced out dwellings and this feature should be retained.</p> <p>We continue to oppose any development on Green Belt land within our Parish.</p>	<p>Agreement and support noted. Comments on preferred locations for development are also noted, although the location of future development will be detailed in the Council's Core Strategy and Land Allocations DPDs.</p> <p>Mix of designs is an important consideration, however the design SPD is not prescriptive on what should be provided, it does however provide broad guidelines and encourages designers to think about the context of the site and how the development should positively respond to and respect it. Never-the-less preventing anywhere standards is one of the key objectives of the document.</p> <p>An additional point regarding village identity has been added to the design principles - Enhancement of entrance to village to improve village identity</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Ickleford Parish Council - Chairman		5.8 Ickleford	Comment	<p>On Question 5 relating to Ickleford Village and the Design principles given in your report.</p> <p>The Parish Council will ensure that all trees are protected through the Village as we have always done.</p> <p>In terms of strengthening the gateways and centre of the Village, over the past year we have installed new Welcome signs at all entrances to the Village which we consider totally adequate, and the centre of the Village has sufficient "directional" signs, historic buildings and environmental aspects that again we feel any visitor would be able to identify with to ensure they had an enjoyable visit.</p>	Comments noted
Knebworth Parish Council		5.10 Knebworth	Object	<p>Although Knebworth is often included in the urban umbrella it is still a rural area. Therefore the proposal to increase building heights at key junctions and within corner plots would alter the character of the village and should be removed from the design principles. Development within the village centre should be no more than two storeys</p>	Knebworth is a large village. Design Principles identify two storeys as the predominant height of buildings. Only at key points should an increase in height be considered.
Knebworth Estates		5.10 Knebworth	Support	<p>Knebworth Estates strongly agrees with Clause 323, that "Opportunities to create new public spaces within the centre of Knebworth should be explored". Knebworth is poorly served in areas of public space per capita (if Stevenage is 6.5 hectares per 1,000 residents, Knebworth is more like 6.5 hectares per its full population of going on 5,000). Thus Knebworth Estates does not agree with the contradictory Design Principle in Clause 325 that "The relatively dense character of the centre should be maintained", nor, necessarily, Clause 322, that "buildings should provide continuity of frontage directly to the pavement along London Road to provide good enclosure to the street". These do not sound like "village" design principles. Opportunities to create public space is the priority, not maintaining density.</p>	Knebworth is a large village. The centre of the village is relatively dense in comparison to other parts of the settlement. Buildings providing continuity of frontage along London Road identifies it as the main street and heart of the village.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Stevens		5.10 Knebworth	Comment	<p>There is no mention of the blight of Knebworth in commuter parking on every weekday. Many roads are clogged with commuter cars from 7am-6pm to the detriment of the residents. This the reality as compared with the design theories - junctions are blocked, driveways impeded and verges damaged. Road cleaning is impossible, all this detracts from living conditions and has been a fact of Knebworth life for far too long. It would improve the village enormously if one of our elected bodies addressed the problem with energy and purpose i.e. The Parish Council, NHDC, Herts CC or MP -but no-one wants to face up to the problem. Perhaps they are more interested in improving their expenses/salaries. Meanwhile commuter park on our roads to avoid parking fees and ruin our environment. If you are interested look up my house on google street view and see the damage to the verges - this is because the refuse lorries cannot pass my house because the narrow road is occupies by commuter cars. Most days I have 6 or 7 cars outside my house all day long. Address the reality rather than the theory.</p>	<p>Comments noted and passed onto Highway Authority and NHDC Transport Officer.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
New Road Developments Ltd	Savills on behalf of New Road Development Ltd	5.11 Little Wymondley	Comment	<p>In considering the wording within Section 5.11 on Little Wymondley, we note the broad description of the morphology of the settlement and the fact that much of the development is located on the west side of the railway line.</p> <p>The three bullet points under the section Design Principles would appear to be the design principles that are applicable although we would suggest that these would not be considered as exhaustive.</p> <p>One particular bullet point that we believe needs further explanation is the third one which states gateways into the village should be retained and strengthened.</p> <p>It is difficult to assess what is actually meant by this wording without further detailed text given the definition of a gateway in the context of a settlement can mean many things to many people. Whilst we accept that this document should not go into detailed prescriptive guidance, we feel that in this instance that reference to gateways requires further clarity and we would ask the Council to make necessary changes to this part of the document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Defintion of 'gateway' included in Appendix C Glossary for clarity.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
R A Pilkington Esq	Savills (L & P) Limited	5.12 Offley	Object	<p>Paragraph 16 on page 5 of the document states that the SPD has been produced by North Hertfordshire District Council to inspire, raise standards and influence the design of development to ensure it respects and complements the existing built character and natural environment of the District. Section 4 is said to cover specific design guidance of the towns, villages and rural areas.</p> <p>Pages 47 and 48 refer to the village of Great Offley. Having regard to the reference to specific design guidance (as stated above) we think it fair to say that there is little detail of this within this extract, nor indeed within the other settlements described within the SPD. That is not intended as a criticism but rather reflects the varying degrees to which local planning authorities across the region address design issues at the local level.</p> <p>As far as the text for Great Offley refers, the Officers at the Council should be aware that a site in the village has been the subject of specific pre-application discussion the former allotment site east of Luton Road. A meeting between ourselves and the Officers took place on the 17th December 2010 at the Council offices and it was surprising that no reference was made to this emerging design guidance and its applicability or otherwise to our clients land.</p> <p>Certainly the advice that we received from your Officers at the meeting and in John Chapmans letter and enclosures dated 14th January 2011, was that the former allotment land east of Luton Road falls within the settlement envelope where there is no objection to the principle of development on the site. It is against this background that our representations are made - clearly it is important that the</p>	<p>The Design SPD provides guidance on the design of any future development but does not address the issue of where development will take place. That issue is covered by policies in the LDF.</p> <p>The coloured areas on the maps represent character not land use. Map amended to include two white areas on map, rear of High Street and School Lane, in Pre 1st WW zone. Brown wash removed from part of Luton Road. Definition of 'gateway' included in Appendix C for clarity.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>wording within the Great Offley section is not capable of being interpreted by others which would conflict with ours and the Council Officers position. At present, we think it could, and accordingly suggest that more clarity is needed on certain issues.</p> <p>Under Landmarks and Views (paragraph 337) the text refers to references to the two visual character areas listed in the Saved Local Plan. Appreciating these are factual references, we consider it would be helpful if the Luton Road reference was placed in a more up-to-date context. To this end, we would suggest that it be amended in the draft SPD to read:</p> <p>Luton Road protecting the frontage at the bend given the allotments have now been relocated.</p> <p>Under Design Principles it is considered that the third and fourth bullet points are capable of wide interpretation and it is not really clear to the reader what these principles are intending to do. For instance, we would respectfully suggest that the retention of the views in and out of the village and strengthening the gateway to the settlement would be applicable to every village, yet this does not seem to be the case in terms of references to the document.</p> <p>Additionally there is no indication which views or indeed which gateways are relevant. There may well be a temptation in this context to suggest that any new development that affects views into the village should be resisted. Development on the former allotment land east of Luton Road, for instance, will have a visual impact on its surroundings and it is neither in our interests nor the Officers</p>	

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>interests to potentially generate a false interpretation on the site which is agreed as a location for new housing as a matter of principle. In such circumstances we consider that more appropriate wording which perhaps would not contradict the Officers expressed views on the former allotment land would be helpful and suggest that the third bullet point be re-worded to read:</p> <p>Development occurring within the settlement envelope should be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the visual character areas are not adversely affected.</p> <p>Regarding the fourth bullet point, there is similarly no particular guidance in this detailed part of the Plan as to which gateways are referred to. Again, it is important that the Council do not intentionally or otherwise give the impression that land east of Luton Road is a gateway to Offley. This is former allotment land within the village boundary with an intention to retain an un-built frontage on the roadside with a backdrop of new housing behind such a principle has been established at our pre-application meeting.</p> <p>We consider that in this instance, the Council needs to express this intention much more clearly and on a detailed basis, as at the moment the fourth bullet point is far too vague to be meaningful.</p> <p>The above comments are of course also relevant to the Great Offley Plan which is forming part of the consultation document. Whilst we understand the broad sentiment of what this Plan is trying to show, the nature of defining these areas is often fraught with difficulty. Indeed we note that</p>	

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>there is an area of white land clearly within the settlement envelope and north of our clients land at the former allotment land which does not have any designation.</p> <p>Secondly, the former allotment land shown east of Luton Road is defined as open space and there is a concern that such a term being used to identify this site may well be interpreted as its future use within the context of the LDF process. Clearly such an interpretation is misplaced given the recent agreement at Officer level that the site falls within the settlement envelope and where the principle of development is accepted.</p> <p>In such circumstances, it may be more appropriate to simply define that area as former allotment land.</p>	

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Tait		5.15 Reed	Support	<p>I am in broad agreement with this design policy as it enhances the natural character and charm of this village.</p> <p>Reed is a unique village as it has an open settlement form around a square pattern of roads and lanes. There is no central developed area and the buildings are in small scattered groups.</p> <p>The central section in Reed is a mix of paddocks and groups of dwellings covering an area from Reed Joint in the north to Reed Hall in the south.</p> <p>The lack of a village core means there is no physical main street or high street where traditionally you might find higher density development. This adds to the open character of the village</p> <p>The current suggested design principles for Reed are:</p> <p>The open nature of the village and particularly the central square should be protected from any future infill. It provides the village with its unique character</p> <p>I am in support of this suggested design plan for the village as it protects the existing and unique open character of the village.</p> <p>Meadows and open spaces are the at core of the community and any future development should be built around this open centre, not in this centre area.</p>	Support is noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Tait		5.15 Reed	Object	<p>The pre war boundary for Reed has some considerable omissions , particularly in the area of Crow lane and the junction with Reed Joint road.</p> <p>There was a considerable development of some 6 cottages including a public house and a blacksmiths located at the junction of Crow lane and Reed Joint.</p> <p>The attachment photo indicates the size and substance of these dwellings which were standing on this northern boundary of the village, from well before the first world war until 1929. These historical records should be accurately recorded in the Reed map as presented. The record of this development is held in the Historic Environment Records Dept in County Hall Hertford.</p>	The design SPD classifies buildings into different classifications as they exist now. Therefore any buildings that no longer exist will not be represented on the maps.
Tait		5.15 Reed	Comment	The historic section (pre 1st world war) of the Reed map is lacking display of Crow Cottages, the location of which is shown on the attached map being the junction of Crow lane and Reed Joint road	The design SPD classifies buildings into different classifications as they exist now. Therefore any buildings that no longer exist will not be represented on the maps.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Tait		5.15 Reed	Support	<p>Reed as a village has an open settlement form around a square pattern of roads and lanes. There is no central developed area and the buildings are in small scattered groups.</p> <p>The lack of a village core means there is no physical main street or high street where traditionally you might find higher density development. This adds to the open character of the village</p> <p>Information from the recent survey (March 2011)of the community in Reed is that whilst most of the community do not wish to see any development in the central meadow area of the village,70% of the residents agree that some development is acceptable, but not in the above central location</p>	<p>Comments on future development in Reed are noted. This is in conformity with the design principles identified in the SPD,</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Andrews		5.15 Reed	Comment	<p>The coloured plan on which comment is invited contains many inaccuracies. I will limit my comments on that area of Reed to the west of Crow Lane and to the north of Crow Lane coloured blue and described as pre 1st World War. There are in fact three detached properties in this area (1) Orchard House 1980's (2) Windrush 1960's (3) The Pastures 1970's which were built during the past 50 years. These properties should be identified under the description of lower density residential.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>The area of land located in the north east corner of Reed and known as North farm should be considered for future low density residential development. The site is shown edged pink on the attached ordnance survey map. Part of this site previously accommodated properties known as Crow Cottages, a beerhouse and a smithy all of which was demolished c1929. A photograph of these buildings is enclosed. North Farm House and outbuildings remain together with approximately 6 acres of grassland which has been used for amenity purposes for the past 40 years.</p>	<p>The map has been amended in line with your comments regarding the three modern properties along Crow Lane and their reclassification.</p> <p>Comments on North Farm are noted, however this document does not make decisions on the appropriateness of land for residential development this is the responsibility of the Core Strategy and Land Allocations DPDs.</p>
Tait		5.15 Reed	Object	<p>Map of Reed</p> <p>The buildings shown on the west-side of the A10 are not part of the Parish of Reed.</p> <p>They are part of the Parish of Therfield, which extends to the A10. The boundary of the Parish of Reed is the A10.</p>	<p>Although the buildings on the adjacent side of the A10 are not in the parish of Reed they do provide useful context to the setting and influence the design on the western side of the village.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Tait		5.15 Reed	Support	<p>Reed</p> <p>The reasons given for keeping the centre meadows open and free from development are logical and make good sense. Because Reed has developed with straight roads, making a square around the centre meadows, it is important to maintain the openness of the centre meadows, with any future development on the periphery of the village, outside the centre meadows.</p>	Comments on Reed are noted.
Reed Parish Council - Clerk		5.15 Reed	Support	<p>The Parish Council is in agreement with the statements and the map of Reed Village.</p> <p>The description of the village contained in the North Herts Sustainable Development Consultation was felt to be accurate by the parish council.</p>	Agreement noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Open Planning		5.15 Reed	Comment	<p>Land to the rear of Reed House is identified as an appropriate residential development opportunity which will assist in supporting and enhancing the sustainability of the village without compromising the attributes that are critical to the character and appearance of the settlement. Whilst the site has been subject to an appeal in and notwithstanding that the policy context has altered since this decision the technical impediments that resulted in a dismissal of the appeal can be overcome.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the land to the rear of Reed house would be suitable for such housing development.</p> <p>The site is approximately 1.2 ha in size and therefore could support a carefully designed residential scheme which fits in with the character and style of the village.</p> <p>The site has access from The Joint and any residential development in this location would not have any detrimental impact on the open nature of the village. It would also enable development to occur without impacting on the central square of the village and would therefore help to maintain the unique character of the village.</p> <p>Reed is a 'selected' village for the purposes of development and is considered to be a sustainable community by virtue of the infrastructure which exists such as the school, village hall, public house etc. In this respect the development of additional housing would be appropriate and support the future development aspirations for the village.</p> <p>It is proposed that the site is designated for residential use.</p>	Comments noted.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Shire Consulting		5.16 Sandon	Comment	Paragraph 368 on Design Principles for Sandon states that "The entrance to the village along Rushden Road from the south should be protected from future development." This too is attempting to set policy, without any justification or evidence, in a document that will not be tested at examination. That also conflicts with Government policy.	The design principle has been amended to read • <i>The entrance to the village along Rushden Road is an important feature of the village that should be enhanced .</i>
Moore		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Comment	<p>Paragraph 374. The old part of Gosmore is centred on the High Street/Maydencroft Lane and part of Waterdell Lane where the village green is located with later developments both North along Hitchin Road and eastwards.</p> <p>This is actually more correctly summarised at Paragraph 376.</p> <p>Paragraph 379. If anything, Gosmore has a more closely knit character than St Ippolyts as can be seen from the photograph at Figure 35 - View of the Church at St Ippolyts.</p> <p>As far as paragraph 380 is concerned, all the Design Principles are to be welcomed.</p>	Para 374 amended as suggested. Para 379 amended as suggested.

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Moore		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Comment	<p>I have enclosed a copy of the village map of Gosmore and St Ippolyts which I would commend as being much more informed, and a great improvement. I would merely make the following points:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The names at the top should be reversed so that it clearly shows Gosmore on the left, and St Ippolyts on the right. 2. I still believe the existing Gosmore Conservation Area, a long established and well respected boundary, should be used as a permanent village boundary. Although I can see this is now a much improved and more informed drawing over what went before. Specifically, I have marked a further red line so as to include the Old Coach House and its annex, along Maydencroft Lane. 3. I would also suggest the inclusion of Gosmore Bury. It seems strange to include part of the front garden only of Gosmore Bury, within the village and leave out the house itself. 4. Slightly pedantically, a little part of Maydencroft Lane, and half of The Crescent have also mistakenly been coloured in pink - Lower Density Mixed Residential, whereas, the rest of the map is sharper by excluding all the other roads from this unit. 5. I note two areas have been tinted grey - Employment; I would also suggest both the Three Acre Nursery and Paul Bromfields Aquatic Nurseries, in Maydencroft Lane, Gosmore, also be shaded grey for Employment, if only for consistency, as they are also currently used for employment. 	<p>Comments noted. 1. Name on map amended to 'St Ippolyts'. 2. Map shows character of areas and does not identify a village boundary. 3. Map amended to exclude Gosmore Bury. 4. Map amended as suggested. 5. Areas are outside the character boundary.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Skeggs		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Comment	<p>St Ippolyts and Gosmore pages 56 and 57 Brookend has not been included in St Ippolyts village which we consider it should be. The Council's electoral register includes The Foundry House and The Foundry Cottage under St Ippolyts Village entry and we use this as our postal address with post code. St Ippolyts and Gosmore plan Two 'Employment' areas have been included in our road which in addition to business premises, horse grazing and stables includes residential properties:- The Foundry House and The Foundry Cottage are both private residences and there is no employment on my land. Nearby properties Brookend Farm with Long Barn are also private residences. Consider it would be more appropriate to designate these areas as 'Lower density mixed residential' the same as Maydencroft Lane and west of Hitchin Road, Gosmore which also includes various businesses and farm premises. We agree with the Design Principles.</p>	<p>Comments noted and para 371 amended to reflect boundary between settlements. Employment area opposite Church deleted. Lower density character area washed over buildings.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
St Ippolyts Parish Council		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Support	<p>Document pages 56 and 57</p> <p>There is the issue of where is the boundary between Gosmore and St Ippolyts. Your document refers to: Gosmore is located on the west side of the B656 and St Ippolyts is located on the ridge overlooking Hitchin to the north and the small valley to the west with contains Ippollitts Brook, etc.</p> <p>Fig 34 shows The Crescent, Gosmore but it is in St Ippolyts. The postal addresses for The Crescent, Mill Road, Orchard Close, Townsend Place and Waterdell Lane are St Ippolyts not Gosmore. Brookend has not been included but it is in St Ippolyts village.</p> <p>The spelling of the saint St Ippolyts should be St Hippolytus. St Ippolyts CE Primary School is referred to as village school and St Ippolyts Parish Hall is referred to as village hall which is incorrect.</p> <p>Map</p> <p>Three modern residential properties in Waterdell Lane appear to have been included as pre 1st World War. In Gosmore employment and residential has been shown as 'Lower density mixed residential' but two areas in Brookend have been shown as 'Employment' which appears not to be consistent as they also include listed residential properties. The new churchyard has not been included.</p> <p>My council agrees with the Design Principles for Gosmore and St Ippolyts villages.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Para 371 amended to reflect boundary between settlements. Paras 372, 373 & 374 have been amended to take into account comments. Fig 34 amended to read St Ippolyts.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Ippollitts Local History Group		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Comment	<p>We have looked at this document and some of the background documents referred to in Local Context and Appendices which we found most interesting.</p> <p>Local Context Although we have copies of Gosmore & St Ippolyts Conservation maps we were unable to locate on your website Conservation Area Character Statements which are referred to and sent email on 18 March but have not received a reply.</p> <p>St Ippolyts and Gosmore pages 56 and 57</p> <p>Although we agree that the name of the parish is spelt in different ways, the former official spelling for civil parish of Ippollitts and village of St Ippollitts was changed to the ecclesiastical spelling of St Ippolyts sometime ago.</p> <p>The church is dedicated to St Hippolytus and it would be nice if you could change the spelling on your document.</p> <p>According to the 1878 Accounts for Restoration of St Ippolyts church this consisted of rebuilding three of the walls and erecting new roof over nave and both aisles, etc.</p> <p>The dates for the two listed buildings are different to those shown on the Listed Buildings register and would be interesting to include that 1 Jolly Tailors was a beer house.</p> <p>Although we agree that St Ippolyts village is on the east side of the B656 which incidentally includes Brookend (the road from B656 to the church and school) we do not consider the designation of Gosmore west of B656 is accurate.</p> <p>An estate of 84 houses named Town's End Place, St Ippollitts was built by former Hitchin Rural District Council after WW1 but the name changed to The Crescent, Mill Road and Waterdell Lane (part) prior to 1950. A member of our group who lives in The Crescent considers she lives in St Ippolyts. Another member had a bungalow built in Waterdell Lane in 1953 considers she lives in St Ippolyts and another member who used to lived in Waterdell Lane</p>	<p>Comments noted. Para 371 amended to reflect boundary between settlements. 'Village school' changed to 'primary school'. 'Village hall' changed to 'Parish Hall'. Fig 34 amended to read St Ippolyts. Employment area opposite school deleted. Lower density character area washed over buildings.</p>

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
				<p>said Gosmore village used to end where the former council's housing started. However, the postal addresses for The Crescent, Mill Road, Waterdell Lane plus Orchard Close built in the orchard of Victoria House, Gosmore and Townsend Place bungalows are St Ippolyts. Some local people refer to top village and bottom village.</p> <p>In paragraph 373 please would you change the name of village school to primary school.</p> <p>In paragraph 374 please would you change village hall to parish hall, the latter has never been a village hall according the deeds and associated records. The parish hall and shop are in St Ippolyts.</p> <p>St Ippolyts and Gosmore plan</p> <p>Some modern houses in Waterdell Lane have been included as pre WW1. In Maydencroft Lane and west of Hitchin Road, Gosmore employment and residential have be shown as 'Lower density mixed residential' and we are querying why two areas in Brookend have been shown as 'Employment' as these areas also includes residential properties. We have also noticed that the new churchyard has not been included in St Ippolyts village.</p> <p>We agree with the Design Principles.</p>	

Representations and Officer Responses

Consultee	Agent	Document section	Rep type	Representation	Officer comment
Osborne		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Comment	<p>I wish to draw your attention to the area on the map of the document:</p> <p>http://www.north-herts.gov.uk/st.ipps_gosmore-3.pdf</p> <p>that concerns Brookend in St, Ippolyts.</p> <p>This ceased to be a working farm before the 1970s, and has, since that date, been a private dwelling with an adjoining field used for light grazing. In no way could this be considered an area of employment.</p>	Map amended. Employment area opposite church deleted. Lower density character area washed over buildings.
Osborne		5.17 St Ippolyts and Gosmore	Comment	<p>Brookend Farm with Long Barn (SG4 7NU) now comprise two properties (coloured grey for employment).</p> <p>Brookend Farm & Long Barn are both private residences & there is no employment on the site.</p> <p>There is no employment on the adjacent field with barns (also marked grey) which are used as horse grazing & stabling.</p>	Map amended. Employment area opposite church deleted. Lower density character area washed over buildings.
Therfield Parish Council		5.18 Therfield	Support	The parish council agreed with the description of the village in the North Herts Draft Design Consultation.	Agreement with village description is noted.