

Appendix 2

Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Statement of Consultation

June 2026

Introduction

This consultation statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of [The Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#).

The statement sets out who, when and how interested parties were consulted when preparing the draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The statement also summarises the representations received and how they have influenced the revised SPD.

The Developer Contributions SPD sets out detailed guidance on the type and scale of developer contributions that will be sought to support new development in North Hertfordshire and supports Policy SP7 in the Local Plan.

Consultation on the Developer Contributions SPD

The draft SPD was approved for consultation at [Cabinet on 23 September 2025](#).

Notifications were sent by email or post to a wide range of statutory and non-statutory consultees, developers and agents, Town and Parish Councils and any other interested parties who have signed up for Local Plan updates. The consultation documents were made available on our website and at the Council Offices.

Consultation took place between 6 November 2025 and 16 January 2026.

In total, 55 individual representations were received from 14 consultees. Respondents included residents, housebuilders and planning agents. Representations were received through the Council's online consultation software and by email. The responses to the consultation are summarised in Appendix A.

Changes made to the Developer Contributions SPD

The consultation draft SPD included a number of areas where we considered that updates were necessary. These included:

- Deleting references throughout the document to developer contributions requested by Hertfordshire County Council;
- Updating and providing details with regard to Biodiversity Net Gain;
- Updating the open space standards to reflect new guidance from Fields in Trust and introducing tiers of open space incorporating the Fields in Trust standards; and
- General updating of relevant strategies and guidance where it has been updated or new guidance has been published.

Recommendation

Following the consultation, all representations have been reviewed and fully considered. Some representations were not directly relevant to the scope of the SPD, but where appropriate, changes have been made to the final version of the SPD.

Following the consultation and reviewing the representations, it is recommended that the SPD, as modified under the powers of S23(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) is presented to Cabinet with a resolution to adopt.

Appendix A: Summary of representations received and responses

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
Introduction		
General	<p>A number of comments were made about transport and car parking in Codicote and the effect of development on the road network in Baldock.</p>	<p>The comments are noted and where appropriate these have been forwarded to the Development Management Team to be considered as part of the planning applications.</p> <p>No changes have been made in the Developer Contributions SPD as the issues cannot be addressed through the SPD.</p>
	<p>Previously, Anglian Water Services have advised that developer contributions have not been required. However, that situation may change in the next decade as current Ofwat funding is unlikely to meet the investment needed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This will be kept under review through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Local Plan Review.</p>
	<p>A number of representations referred to typographical errors and inaccurate links to other paragraphs throughout the document.</p>	<p>These errors have been corrected.</p>
1.1.3	<p>The relationship with the HCC Guide to Developer Infrastructure Contributions, 2024 should be made clear</p>	<p>In the adopted Developer Contributions SPD, there were a number of sections which considered developer contributions requested by Hertfordshire County Council.</p>

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
		<p>The County Council has subsequently published its own Guide to Developer Infrastructure Contributions in 2024. To avoid confusion and duplication, the Developer Contributions SPD has been amended to delete the detailed references to developer contributions requested by the County Council and where appropriate these have been replaced with links to the County Council’s website.</p>
1.10.2	<p>A number of representations and concerns were made in respect of this paragraph on the delivery of infrastructure ahead of planned development. The concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the approach is consistent with national guidance and the statutory tests for planning obligations; • That additional guidance should be included in the SPD to establish how proportionate contributions would be determined to ensure that any required contributions would be fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind of development; • That guidance should be added to this section to ensure that the Council do not seek to use this retrospectively fund infrastructure already in place; and • Additional text should be added to state that contributions should only be sought if they meet the 	<p>The SPD was amended prior to consultation to ensure that the Council can seek contributions for infrastructure ahead of multiple planned developments to address the specific needs of an area. It is considered reasonable for large multiple planned developments to pay for infrastructure that has been future funded so that it can be delivered at the same as time or ahead of such development. This will help build confidence for the public in accepting development and of making the link between developments and the benefits they provide. Statutory planning obligation tests will still apply. Paragraph 1.10.2 already refers to defined expectations in relation to any future funding of projects, however, an additional reference to timescales has also been added for further clarity.</p>

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
	tests as set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).	
Process, Procedure & Management		
2.2.4	A comment was made about development proposals changing between the pre-application stage and submission of the proposals and that the level of developer contributions needed can also change over that time.	Additional text has been added into the paragraph to clarify that the required timescales may be prescribed by Planning Control Committee within any resolution to grant planning permission.
	Separately, a comment was made that discussions about developer contributions should include any organisations seeking developer contributions, in addition to specific Council services and that those organisations should be defined as “requestors”.	No amendments have been made in response to these comments. Clear priorities for new infrastructure provision will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. These priorities will determine what S106 contributions can be requested by the case officer when considering an application.
2.3.4	A representation sought an amendment to reflect that there could be a difference in the level of developer contributions between the pre-application and application stage.	No amendments have been made as any significant changes would be considered as part of the Development Management process.
2.8.2	A representation from the County Council requested that the paragraph should not be deleted from the Developer Contributions SPD.	All references to the HCC Guide to Developer Infrastructure Contributions have been deleted throughout this document to avoid duplication and

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
		references to indexation for HCC contributions should be included in the HCC Guide.
Economy and Town Centres		
General	One comment was received which noted the vibrancy and vitality of Codicote High Street.	Comment noted.
3.2.1	The paragraph should include additional guidance and examples of how developers can create skill opportunities for local people.	An additional reference has been included in the SPD to refer to the Economic Development Strategy and any associated Action Plans.
Transport		
General	Comments were made in respect of travel, transport and congestion because of new development proposals in Baldock and the need for car park provision in Codicote which should be provided by new development.	<p>The comments which were made in respect of Baldock will be forwarded to be considered as part of the public consultation responses to the planning application for North of Baldock.</p> <p>The comments made in respect of Codicote cannot be addressed directly through the Developer Contributions SPD. Developer Contributions can only be used for projects to help mitigate the effects of development; they cannot be used for unrelated local improvements. However, some of those issues have been addressed through the Codicote Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
	An observation was made that the table illustrating the Local Plan policies and other relevant strategies and guidance included the Vehicle Parking SPD which dated and that it would be helpful if there was a single document published.	Residential parking standards are set in the Local Plan, rather than through a separate SPD. New parking standards will be considered as part of the new Local Plan which, in line with the new NPPF.t.
4.2.5	Representations state that an amendment should be made to the paragraph to provide further guidance as to how a “proportionate contribution” will be calculated.	No amendments made. A proportionate contribution will need to be determined and agreed on a site by site basis as it will depend on the scale of the impact.
Housing		
General	<p>Comments were received in respect of the design of new homes and that on social housing.</p> <p>The comments about social housing stated that no more social housing should be built in North Hertfordshire, it should not be combined with private dwellings and that in the long term, it should all be returned to the private sector.</p> <p>There were a number of supporting representations were received in respect of the proposed deletions and minor wording additions in this chapter of the SPD.</p>	<p>The design of new housing cannot be addressed through the Developer Contributions SPD, but the District Design Code may have an influence in new developments in the future.</p> <p>The demand for housing in the District is high and market cost housing is increasingly out of reach for many households. Households who are without adequate housing and who cannot afford to buy or rent suitable housing are in housing need. The Council is committed to meeting this housing need through the provision of affordable housing in the district. Allocations for new development in the Local Plan can help to achieve that.</p>

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
		A number of typographical issues were picked up in this part of the SPD and these have been corrected and additional text added where appropriate, including references to the District Design Code.
5.2.14 – 5.2.16	Although no changes had been proposed to this section of the SPD, Vacant Building Credit, detailed wording changes were put forward in the representations to simplify this section of the SPD.	Agreed and amendments have been made to this section of the SPD.
Design		
General	The representations included comments about air quality in Baldock, the design of recycling / bin storage in developments and whether the Developer Contributions SPD strayed into policy on the design of waste storage.	<p>The comments which were made in respect of Baldock will be forwarded to be considered as part of the public consultation responses to the planning application for North of Baldock.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to delete the previous guidance and include references to new guidance which has been prepared by the East and North Herts Shared Waste Service for developers and to the District Design Code.</p>
Healthy Communities		
General	The representations included a comment about health facilities in Baldock and water supply following the major fire in the town.	The comments which were made in respect of Baldock will be forwarded to be considered as part of the public

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
	<p>There was also a representation which outlined the health and recreational facilities in Codicote.</p> <p>In addition, there were representations in respect of the sport facilities provided in Royston at Therfield Heath and the conflicts that can arise between the needs of the sport facilities and the open common land and the SSSI. No amendments to the SPD were put forward.</p>	<p>consultation responses to the planning application for North of Baldock.</p> <p>A number of additional references have been included in the SPD where new guidance has been published.</p>
Section 7.2	The Central East Integrated Care Board made representations in respect of the Section 7.2 and put forward a series of amendments to ensure that the SPD is up to date.	The amendments suggested by the Central East Integrated Care Board have been included in the SPD to ensure that the SPD is up to date and reflects the levels of financial contributions required for health care.
Section 7.3	A number of representations were made in respect of this section, Indoor and Outdoor Sport Facilities being included in the Natural Environment section of the SPD.	A new section has been included in the SPD, Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport Facilities, taking those elements from the existing Healthy Communities chapter and creating a new section which should make the SPD easier to use.
Natural Environment		
General	Comments were made in respect of contributions towards biodiversity associated with new development.	These comments are noted and it should be noted that there is a requirement for developers to provide on site Biodiversity Net Gain.
	There was support for the overall approach to securing developer contributions and in particular the potential	Noted

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
	for securing contributions in the future for chalk stream projects.	
	Representations were received in respect of solar farms in Baldock and the associated loss of agricultural land and decentralised energy being extended to villages.	Neither of these issues can be addressed through the Developer Contributions SPD.
Section 8.2	The representations suggested that the Developer Contributions SPD should not include plans for Biodiversity Net Gain and that a separate SPD should be prepared and that the SPD should be updated to reflect future changes in legislation.	The Developer Contributions SPD provides sufficient detail for BNG and there are no plans to prepare a separate SPD for BNG. No further changes are proposed to this SPD to try and address any forthcoming changes that may be made in future policy and legislation.
	A comment was made about the table provided in paragraph 8.2.31 as no BNG pricing details were included.	An amendment has been made to make the table clear and a link to the website has been included to the monitoring fees that the Council has published previously.
Section 8.3	A representation expressing disappointment that the Therfield Heath Mitigation Strategy was referenced in the open space section of the SPD and that the Mitigation Strategy should be used to secure developer contributions for Therfield Heath SSSI.	<p>The Therfield Heath Mitigation Strategy is included as a separate section in the Natural Environment chapter of the SPD. Those parts of the Natural Environment section which refer to open space and sports facilities have been moved to a separate section of the SPD for clarity.</p> <p>Section 8.3 has also been amended to clarify that contributions will be sought in discussions with Natural</p>

Section / Topic / Para. No	Summary of representations	Actions
		England and the Conservators of Therfield Heath and Greens rather than in agreement with.
Section 8.4	A number of representations were made in respect of this section of the SPD. There were no objections to the updating of the Fields in Trust open space standards in the SPD. However, objections were received in respect of the proposed modifications which sought to introduce tiers of open space in developments of different sizes and that open space standards should be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review.	<p>The consultation draft of the Developer Contributions SPD was amended to include the 2024 Fields in Trust open space standards and set out how that open space might be provided in new developments. It is acknowledged that the introduction of “tiers of open space” made the open space requirements more complicated in the context of this document.</p> <p>The Council has subsequently published a District Design Code which explains in more detail how the quantum of open space should be provided in new developments at different scales. The Developer Contributions SPD has been amended to set out just the quantum of open space that developers will be expected to provide with the District Design Code focusing on how that open space is provided.</p>